arXiv:math/0007038v3 [math.QA] 24 Jan 2003

The moduli space of $N = 1$ superspheres with tubes and the sewing operation

Katrina Barron

Department of Mathematics, University of Notre Dame, 255 Hurley Hall, Notre Dame, IN 46556
E-mail address: `kbarron@nd.edu`

Contents

Chapter 1. Introduction 1

Chapter 2. An introduction to the moduli space of $N = 1$ superspheres with tubes and the sewing operation
- 2.1. Grassmann algebras and superanalytic superfunctions 7
- 2.2. Superconformal $(1, 1)$-superfunctions and power series 14
- 2.3. Complex supermanifolds and super-Riemann surfaces 18
- 2.4. Superspheres with tubes and the sewing operation 20
- 2.5. The moduli space of superspheres with tubes 23
- 2.6. The sewing equation 30

Chapter 3. A formal algebraic study of the sewing operation 35
- 3.1. An extension of the automorphism property 36
- 3.2. Formal supercalculus and formal superconformal power series 37
- 3.3. The formal sewing equation and formal sewing identities 55
- 3.4. The $N = 1$ Neveu-Schwarz algebra and a representation in terms of superderivations 78
- 3.5. Modules for the $N = 1$ Neveu-Schwarz algebra 80
- 3.6. Realizations of the sewing identities for general representations of the $N = 1$ Neveu-Schwarz algebra 8
- 3.7. The corresponding identities for positive-energy representations of the $N = 1$ Neveu-Schwarz algebra 8

Chapter 4. An analytic study of the sewing operation 89
- 4.1. A reformulation of the moduli space of superspheres with tubes 91
- 4.2. An action of the symmetric group S_n on the moduli space $SK(n)$ 93
- 4.3. Supermeromorphic superfunctions on SK and supermeromorphic tangent spaces of SK 95
- 4.4. The sewing operation and superspheres with one, two, and three tubes 96
- 4.5. Generalized superspheres with tubes 103
- 4.6. The sewing formulas and the convergence of associated series via the Fischer-Grauert Theorem 105
- 4.7. An $N = 1$ Neveu-Schwarz algebra structure of central charge zero on the supermeromorphic tangent sp

Bibliography 133

Abstract

Within the framework of complex supergeometry and motivated by two-dimensional genus-zero holomorphic $N = 1$ superconformal field theory, we define the moduli space of $N = 1$ genus-zero super-Riemann surfaces with oriented and ordered half-infinite tubes, modulo superconformal equivalence. We define a sewing operation on this moduli space which gives rise to the sewing equation and normalization and boundary conditions. To solve this equation, we develop a formal theory of infinitesimal $N = 1$ superconformal transformations based on a representation of the $N = 1$ Neveu-Schwarz algebra in terms of superderivations. We solve a formal version of the sewing equation by proving an identity for certain exponentials of superderivations involving infinitely many formal variables. We use these formal results to give a reformulation of the moduli space, a more detailed description of the sewing operation, and an explicit formula for obtaining a canonical supersphere with tubes from the sewing together of two canonical superspheres with tubes. We give some specific examples of sewings, two of which give geometric analogues of associativity for an $N = 1$ Neveu-Schwarz vertex operator superalgebra. We study a certain linear functional in the supermeromorphic tangent space at the identity of the moduli space of superspheres with $1 + 1$ tubes (one outgoing tube and one incoming tube) which is associated to the $N = 1$ Neveu-Schwarz element in an $N = 1$ Neveu-Schwarz vertex operator superalgebra. We prove the analyticity and convergence of the infinite series arising from the sewing operation. Finally, we define a bracket on the supermeromorphic tangent space at the identity of the moduli space of superspheres with $1 + 1$ tubes and show that this gives a representation of the $N = 1$ Neveu-Schwarz algebra with central charge zero.

Received by editor July 17, 2000.

AMS Subject Classification: Primary 17B65, 17B68, 17B81, 32A05, 32C11, 58A50, 81R10, 81T40, 81T60; Secondary 17B69, 30F10, 32G15.

The author was supported in part by an AAUW American Dissertation Fellowship and by a University of California President's Postdoctoral Fellowship

CHAPTER 1

Introduction

In this monograph, we give a detailed study of the geometry underlying two-dimensional genus-zero holomorphic $N = 1$ superconformal field theory. Conformal field theory (or more specifically, string theory) and related theories (cf. [**BPZ**], [**FS**], [**V**], and [**S**]) are the most promising attempts at developing a physical theory that combines all fundamental particle interactions, including gravity. The geometry of conformal field theory extends the use of Feynman diagrams, describing the interactions of point particles whose propagation in time sweeps out a line in space-time, to one-dimensional "particles" (strings) whose propagation in time sweeps out a two-dimensional surface. For two-dimensional genus-zero holomorphic conformal field theory, these surfaces are genus-zero Riemann surfaces with incoming and outgoing half-infinite tubes, and algebraically, the corresponding string interactions can be described by products of vertex operators or, more precisely, by means of vertex operator algebras (cf. [**Bo**], [**FLM**]). In [**H2**], Huang studies the moduli space of genus-zero Riemann surfaces with tubes and provides a rigorous correspondence between the geometric and algebraic aspects of two-dimensional genus-zero holomorphic conformal field theory.

In [**Fd**], Friedan describes the extension of the physical model of conformal field theory to that of $N = 1$ superconformal field theory and the notion of a superstring whose propagation in time sweeps out a supersurface. Whereas conformal field theory attempts to describe the interactions of bosons, superconformal field theory attempts to describe the interactions of bosons paired with N fermions, for $N = 1, 2, \ldots$. Thus $N = 1$ superconformal field theory describes the interactions of boson-fermion pairs, $N = 2$ superconformal field theory describes the interactions of boson-fermion-fermion triplets, and so on. In this work, we will consider $N = 1$ superconformal field theory. This theory requires an operator D such that $D^2 = \frac{\partial}{\partial z}$. Such an operator arises naturally in $N = 1$ complex supergeometry. This is the geometry of manifolds over a complex Grassmann algebra (i.e., complex supermanifolds) where there is one "even" dimension corresponding to the one boson and one "odd" dimension corresponding to the $N = 1$ fermion in the boson-fermion pairs.

Thus the geometric setting for genus-zero holomorphic $N = 1$ superconformal field theory is the moduli space of $N = 1$ genus-zero super-Riemann surfaces with oriented and ordered half-infinite tubes (which are superconformally equivalent to $N = 1$ superspheres with oriented and ordered punctures, and local superconformal coordinates vanishing at the punctures), modulo superconformal equivalence. In this paper, following [**S**], [**V**], [**H2**] and [**Fd**], we give a rigorous and detailed study of this moduli space. We define a sewing operation on this moduli space which gives rise to the sewing equation and normalization and boundary conditions. Physically, one can view each equivalence class of superspheres in the moduli space as representing some superstring interaction and the sewing operation as corresponding to taking the resulting superstring output of a given interaction as one of the inputs of another superstring interaction and determining the resulting total interaction. To determine this resulting total interaction, one must solve the sewing equation. To solve this equation, we develop a formal theory of infinitesimal $N = 1$ superconformal transformations based on a representation of the $N = 1$ Neveu-Schwarz algebra in terms of superderivations. We solve a formal version of the sewing equation and normalization and boundary conditions by proving an identity for certain exponentials of superderivations involving infinitely many formal variables. We use these formal results to give a reformulation of the moduli space and a more detailed description of the sewing operation. This includes an explicit formula for obtaining a canonical supersphere with tubes from the sewing together of two canonical superspheres with tubes which we obtain from our formal results by interpreting the formal solution to the sewing equation in terms of the analytic and geometric structure of the moduli space and proving the necessary convergence conditions for this formal solution.

Although this monograph is self-contained as a study of the geometry underlying two-dimensional genus-zero holomorphic $N = 1$ superconformal field theory, we next mention an important application of these results to the algebraic aspects of this theory and the correspondence between the algebraic and geometric aspects.

In [**B3**], we extended the notion of vertex operator superalgebra (cf. [**T**], [**G**], [**FFR**], [**DL**], and [**KW**]) to be defined over a Grassmann algebra instead of just $\mathbb{C}$ and to include odd formal variables instead of just even formal variables by introducing the notion of $N = 1$ *Neveu-Schwarz vertex operator superalgebra over a Grassmann algebra and with odd formal variables*. We also proved that the category of $N = 1$ Neveu-Schwarz vertex operator superalgebras over a Grassmann algebra and with odd formal variables is isomorphic to the category of $N = 1$ Neveu-Schwarz vertex operator superalgebras over a Grassmann algebra and without odd formal variables. However, in a vertex operator superalgebra with odd formal variables, the fact that the endomorphism $G(-1/2)$ plays the role of the superconformal operator $D = \frac{\partial}{\partial\theta} + \theta\frac{\partial}{\partial z}$ (as defined in Chapter 2 below) is made explicit, and the correspondence with the supergeometry is more natural.

Most of the results contained in this paper and in [**B3**] were first proved in [**B1**] and a research announcement of these results appeared in [**B2**]. The main result of [**B1**] is the introduction of the notion of $N = 1$ *supergeometric vertex operator superalgebra over a Grassmann algebra* and the following isomorphism theorem:

The Isomorphism Theorem: Projectively, the category of $N = 1$ Neveu-Schwarz vertex operator superalgebras over a Grassmann algebra with (or without) odd formal variables and with central charge $c \in \mathbb{C}$ is isomorphic to the category of $N = 1$ supergeometric vertex operator superalgebras over a Grassmann algebra and with central charge $c \in \mathbb{C}$.

This isomorphism theorem provides a rigorous foundation for the correspondence between the algebraic and geometric aspects of two-dimensional genus-zero holomorphic $N = 1$ superconformal field theory. The results contained in this paper give the geometric development necessary to establish this correspondence, in particular, allowing one to introduce the notion of $N = 1$ supergeometric vertex operator superalgebra, to prove the isomorphism theorem, and to construct the isomorphism explicitly. In addition, in this monograph, we establish certain identities for representations of the $N = 1$ Neveu-schwarz algebra which arise from the geometry but pertain to the general algebraic setting.

The moduli space of $N = 1$ superspheres with tubes and the sewing operation is an example of what is known mathematically as a "partial operad". The notion of operad was introduced by May [**M**], and in [**HL2**], [**HL3**] it was shown that the moduli space of spheres with tubes together with the sewing operation defined in [**H1**] is a partial operad. Analogously, the moduli space of $N = 1$ superspheres with tubes, together with the sewing operation and action of the symmetric groups defined and studied in this paper, is also a partial operad. The isomorphism theorem can be reformulated as stating that projectively the category of $N = 1$ Neveu-Schwarz vertex operator superalgebras with central charge $c \in \mathbb{C}$ is isomorphic to the category of supermeromorphic graded algebras with central charge $c \in \mathbb{C}$ over this $N = 1$ supersphere with tubes partial operad (cf. [**H2**]). In this sense, one can think of the isomorphism theorem as associating an n-ary product on an infinite-dimensional graded vector space V for every equivalence class of $N = 1$ superspheres with one outgoing tube and $n \in \mathbb{N}$ incoming tubes in this partial operad, and showing that with a couple of additional axioms, these n-ary products define an $N = 1$ Neveu-Schwarz vertex operator superalgebra structure on V.

The results in this paper are an extension of Huang's [**H1**], [**H2**] work on the geometry underlying genus-zero holomorphic conformal field theory. In particular, this paper contains the extension of Chapters 1-4 in [**H2**] to the $N = 1$ super case. Throughout this paper, one may consider the nonsuper case by setting all odd variables, all "soul" Grassmann terms (see Section 2.1 for the definitions), and all odd superalgebra elements equal to zero. In other words, this work subsumes the analogous nonsuper case studied in [**H1**] and [**H2**]. In [**BMS**], Beilinson, Manin and Schechtman study some aspects of $N = 1$ superconformal symmetry, i.e., the $N = 1$ Neveu-Schwarz algebra, from the viewpoint of algebraic geometry. In this work our approach is decidedly differential geometric.

The rigorous foundation for the correspondence between the algebraic and geometric aspects of two-dimensional genus-zero holomorphic conformal and $N = 1$ superconformal field theory developed in [**H1**], [**H2**], and [**B1**] has proved useful in furthering both the algebraic and geometric aspects of conformal and superconformal field theory. On the one hand, it is much easier to rigorously construct conformal field theories and study many of their properties using the algebraic formulation of vertex operator (super)algebra (or equivalently, chiral algebra) (e.g., [**Wi**], [**BPZ**], [**Za**], [**FLM**], [**KT**], [**FZ**], [**FFR**], [**DL**], [**FF**], [**DMZ**], [**Wa**], [**Zh1**], [**Zh2**]). In addition, algebraic settings such as orbifold conformal field theory [**DHVW1**], [**DHVW2**], [**FLM**] and coset models [**GKO**] allow one to construct new conformal field theories from existing ones. On the other hand, the geometry of (super)conformal field theory can give insight and provide tools useful for studying the algebraic aspects of the theory, for example: giving rise to general results in Lie theory [**BHL**]; giving the necessary foundation for developing a theory of tensor products for vertex operator algebras [**HL1**], [**HL4**] – [**HL7**], [**H3**]; giving rise to constructions in orbifold conformal field theory [**BDM**], [**H4**]; and providing a setting for establishing change of variables formulas and other general identities for vertex operator (super)algebras (cf., [**H2**], [**B1**], and Sections 3.6 and 3.7 below).

Furthermore, the geometric formulation is indispensable for understanding both the geometric and algebraic aspects of higher genus theory.

This paper is organized as follows. In Chapter 2, within the framework of complex supergeometry (cf. [**D**], [**Bc1**], [**Ro2**] and [**CR**]) and motivated by two-dimensional genus-zero holomorphic $N = 1$ superconformal field theory, we define the moduli space of $N = 1$ genus-zero super-Riemann surfaces with oriented and ordered punctures, and local superconformal coordinates vanishing at the punctures, modulo superconformal equivalence. We define a sewing operation on this moduli space by taking two superspheres, cutting out closed discs in the DeWitt topology around a puncture in each supersphere and appropriately identifying DeWitt neighborhoods of the boundaries. This then results in a new supersphere with punctures and local superconformal coordinates vanishing at the punctures and is well defined on superconformal equivalence classes. This sewing operation on the moduli space gives rise to the sewing equation and the normalization and boundary conditions.

In Chapter 3, we develop a formal theory of infinitesimal $N = 1$ superconformal transformations based on a representation of the $N = 1$ Neveu-Schwarz algebra in terms of superderivations. We show that any local superconformal coordinate can be expressed in terms of exponentials of these superderivations. We then study the sewing equation from a purely algebraic viewpoint using this new characterization of local superconformal coordinates and give a formal solution to the sewing equation satisfying the normalization and boundary conditions by proving an identity for certain exponentials of superderivations involving infinitely many formal variables. We formulate some additional algebraic identities which arise from certain sewings; prove analogues to the sewing identities for a general representation of the $N = 1$ Neveu-Schwarz algebra, and show that the infinite series occurring in these identities have certain nice properties when the representation is a positive-energy module, for instance, an $N = 1$ Neveu-Schwarz vertex operator superalgebra [**B3**].

In Chapter 4, we give a reformulation of the moduli space of $N = 1$ superspheres with tubes using the results of Chapters 2 and 3 and give a detailed analytic study of the sewing operation in terms of exponentials of representatives of Neveu-Schwarz algebra elements as formulated algebraically in Chapter 3. We define an action of the symmetric groups on the moduli space. This action is needed to establish the fact that the moduli space of superspheres with tubes and the sewing operation is a partial operad. We define supermeromorphic superfunctions and supermeromorphic tangent spaces for the moduli space. These supermeromorphic superfunctions on the moduli space include as examples correlation functions for vertex operators in the algebraic theory of $N = 1$ Neveu-Schwarz vertex operator superalgebras with odd formal variables (see [**B1**], [**B3**]). We study the group-like structures of the moduli space of superspheres with $1 + 1$ tubes (i.e., with one incoming tube and one outgoing tube), and give some specific examples of sewing, two of which give geometric analogues of associativity for an $N = 1$ Neveu-Schwarz vertex operator superalgebra (see [**B1**], [**B3**]). We study a certain linear functional in the supermeromorphic tangent space at the identity of the moduli space of superspheres with $1 + 1$ tubes which is associated to the $N = 1$ Neveu-Schwarz element in an $N = 1$ Neveu-Schwarz vertex operator superalgebra. We then give an explicit formula for obtaining a canonical supersphere with tubes from the sewing together of two canonical superspheres with tubes using the results of Chapters 2 and 3. We prove the analyticity and convergence of certain series resulting from sewing which were obtained algebraically in Chapter 3.

Finally, in Chapter 4 we show that there is a representation of the $N = 1$ Neveu-Schwarz algebra with central charge zero on a subspace of the supermeromorphic tangent space of the moduli space of superspheres with $1 + 1$ tubes at the identity. Thus, projectively, one can think of this moduli space as the partial monoid associated to the $N = 1$ Neveu-Schwarz Lie superalgebra in analogy to the super Lie group associated to a finite-dimensional Lie superalgebra, (cf. [**Ro1**]).

We have written this paper in such a way as to parallel the work of Huang [**H1**], [**H2**] in order to accentuate the similarities and differences between the super and nonsuper cases. The results in this monograph which require significant work or new methods in extending the analogous results of [**H1**], [**H2**] include: Proposition 2.15, Proposition 3.5, Theorem 3.26, Proposition 3.30, Proposition 3.31, Proposition 4.11, Proposition 4.19, and Proposition 4.21. In this monograph, we correct several misprints which appeared in [**B1**], [**B2**], [**H1**], and [**H2**], and present a new proof of Proposition 4.19 which we believe to be more concise and more indicative of the role of the super structure in the analyticity and convergence of the infinite series arising from the sewing operation.

We would like to thank James Lepowsky and Yi-Zhi Huang for their advice, support and expert comments during the writing of the dissertation from which this paper is derived, and their advice on the presentation of this paper.

Notational conventions

$\mathbb{C}$: the complex numbers.

$\mathbb{F}$: a field of characteristic zero.

$\mathbb{N}$: the nonnegative integers.

$\mathbb{Q}$: the rationals.

$\mathbb{R}$: the real numbers.

$\mathbb{R}_+$: the positive real numbers.

$\mathbb{Z}$: the integers.

$\mathbb{Z}_+$: the positive integers.

$\mathbb{Z}_2$: the integers modulo 2.

CHAPTER 2

An introduction to the moduli space of $N = 1$ superspheres with tubes and the sewing operation

In this chapter we introduce the moduli space of $N = 1$ superspheres with tubes and the sewing operation. We begin in Section 2.1 with some background material on superalgebras, Grassmann algebras and superanalytic superfunctions (cf. [**D**], [**Bc1**], [**Ro2**], [**CR**]). In Section 2.2, we give the definition of $N = 1$ superconformal superfunction and make note of the power series expansions of such functions vanishing at zero or infinity. In Section 2.3, we give the definitions of supermanifold and $N = 1$ super-Riemann surface and state the uniformization theorem for $N = 1$ super-Riemann surfaces from [**CR**].

In Section 2.4, we study $N = 1$ superspheres with ordered and oriented tubes, showing that these are superconformally equivalent to superspheres with ordered and oriented punctures and local superconformal coordinates vanishing at the punctures, and we define a sewing operation on this space.

In Section 2.5, we define the moduli space of superspheres with tubes and introduce canonical superspheres with tubes. We then show that any supersphere with tubes is superconformally equivalent to a canonical supersphere with tubes and that two different canonical superspheres with tubes are not superconformally equivalent. This shows that there is a bijection between the set of canonical superspheres with tubes and the moduli space of superspheres with tubes.

Finally, in Section 2.6, we define the sewing operation on the moduli space of superspheres with tubes by showing how to obtain a canonical supersphere from the sewing together of two canonical superspheres. This gives rise to the sewing equation and normalization and boundary conditions on the uniformizing function mapping the two sewn canonical superspheres to the new canonical supersphere. Solving this sewing equation along with the normalization and boundary conditions will be the main objectives in Chapters 3 and 4.

2.1. Grassmann algebras and superanalytic superfunctions

Let $\mathbb{F}$ be a field of characteristic zero. For a $\mathbb{Z}_2$-graded vector space $X = X^0 \oplus X^1$, define the *sign function* η on the homogeneous subspaces of X by $\eta(x) = i$, for $x \in X^i$ and $i = 0, 1$. If $\eta(x) = 0$, we say that x is *even*, and if $\eta(x) = 1$, we say that x is *odd*. Note that $0 \in X$ is both even and odd, i.e., the sign function is double valued for $x = 0$. However, in practice this is never a problem, e.g., in property (ii) below.

A *superalgebra* is an (associative) algebra A (with identity $1 \in A$), such that

(i) A is a $\mathbb{Z}_2$-graded algebra

(ii) $ab = (-1)^{\eta(a)\eta(b)} ba$ for a, b homogeneous in A. (supercommutativity)

We will often write a given element $u \in A$ in terms of its vector space grading, i.e., if $u = u^0 + u^1$ for $u^i \in A^i$, we write $u = (u^0, u^1) \in A^0 \oplus A^1$. Algebraic operations will still, of course, be considered to take place in the algebra A, and we will merely use the vector space decomposition in order to emphasize the $\mathbb{Z}_2$-grading of a given element. Note that when working over a field of characteristic zero or of characteristic greater than two, property (ii), supercommutativity, implies that the square of any odd element is zero.

A $\mathbb{Z}_2$-graded vector space $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{g}^0 \oplus \mathfrak{g}^1$ is said to be a *Lie superalgebra* if it has a bilinear operation $[\cdot, \cdot]$ on $\mathfrak{g}$ such that for u, v homogeneous in $\mathfrak{g}$

(i) $[u, v] \in \mathfrak{g}^{(\eta(u)+\eta(v)) \bmod 2}$

(ii) $[u, v] = -(-1)^{\eta(u)\eta(v)}[v, u]$ (skew-symmetry)

(iii) $(-1)^{\eta(u)\eta(w)}[[u, v], w] + (-1)^{\eta(v)\eta(u)}[[v, w], u] + (-1)^{\eta(w)\eta(v)}[[w, u], v] = 0.$ (Jacobi identity)

Remark 2.1. Given a Lie superalgebra $\mathfrak{g}$ and a superalgebra A, the space $(A^0 \otimes \mathfrak{g}^0) \oplus (A^1 \otimes \mathfrak{g}^1)$ is a Lie algebra with bracket given by

$$[au, bv] = (-1)^{\eta(b)\eta(u)} ab[u, v] \tag{2.1}$$

for $a, b \in A$ and $u, v \in \mathfrak{g}$ homogeneous (with obvious notation), where in (2.1) we have suppressed the tensor product symbol. Note that the bracket on the left-hand side of (2.1) is a Lie algebra bracket, and the bracket on the right-hand side is a Lie superalgebra bracket. We will call $(A^0 \otimes \mathfrak{g}^0) \oplus (A^1 \otimes \mathfrak{g}^1)$ the *A-envelope of* $\mathfrak{g}$. Of course, given two superalgebras A and $\hat{A}$, we can form the *A-envelope of* $\hat{A}$ given by $(A^0 \otimes \hat{A}^0) \oplus (A^1 \otimes \hat{A}^1)$ which is naturally an algebra. In fact, since $A \otimes \hat{A}$ is itself a superalgebra, we see that the A-envelope of $\hat{A}$ is equal to the even homogeneous subspace of $A \otimes \hat{A}$, i.e., $(A \otimes \hat{A})^0$.

For any $\mathbb{Z}_2$-graded associative algebra A and for $u, v \in A$ of homogeneous sign, we can define $[u, v] = uv - (-1)^{\eta(u)\eta(v)} vu$, making A into a Lie superalgebra. The algebra of endomorphisms of A, denoted End A, has a natural $\mathbb{Z}_2$-grading induced from that of A, and defining $[X, Y] = XY - (-1)^{\eta(X)\eta(Y)} YX$ for X, Y homogeneous in End A, this gives End A a Lie superalgebra structure. An element $D \in (\text{End } A)^i$, for $i \in \mathbb{Z}_2$, is called a *superderivation of sign* i (denoted $\eta(D) = i$) if D satisfies the super-Leibniz rule

$$D(uv) = (Du)v + (-1)^{\eta(D)\eta(u)} uDv \tag{2.2}$$

for $u, v \in A$ homogeneous.

Remark 2.2. The above definitions of superalgebra and Lie superalgebra are the standard definitions used. However, we would like to point out that in analogy to associative algebra, commutative algebra, and Lie algebra, a more appropriate definition would have been to define a *superalgebra* to be a $\mathbb{Z}_2$-graded associative algebra, a *supercommutative superalgebra* to be what we called a superalgebra above, and retain our definition of Lie superalgebra. Using the criterion that the "super" version of a structure should be one which introduces a minus sign when two odd elements are exchanged, a $\mathbb{Z}_2$-graded associative algebra vacuously satisfies the criterion for being called a superalgebra. The zero-graded subalgebra of such an algebra is an associative algebra, and the zero-graded subalgebra of a supercommutative superalgebra is a commutative algebra. In addition, the introduction of a bracket operation on a $\mathbb{Z}_2$-graded associative algebra called a superalgebra (and thus with the understanding that a minus sign be introduced when two odd elements are exchanged) would then naturally define a Lie superalgebra in analogy to a Lie algebra arising from an associative algebra. However, to avoid confusion with the literature, we have used the terminology "superalgebra" in the customary way above to denote a "supercommutative superalgebra" and will continue to do so throughout the remainder of this work.

Let $\mathcal{T}(V)$ be the tensor algebra over the vector space V, and let $\mathcal{J}$ be the ideal of $\mathcal{T}(V)$ generated by the elements $v \otimes w + w \otimes v$ for $v, w \in V$. Then the exterior algebra generated by V is given by $\bigwedge(V) = \mathcal{T}(V)/\mathcal{J}$, and $\bigwedge(V)$ has the structure of a superalgebra. For $L \in \mathbb{N}$, fix V_L to be an L-dimensional vector space over $\mathbb{C}$ with fixed basis $\{\zeta_1, \zeta_2, \ldots, \zeta_L\}$ such that $V_L \subset V_{L+1}$. We denote $\bigwedge(V_L)$ by $\bigwedge_L$ and call this the *Grassmann algebra on L generators.* In other words, from now on we will consider the Grassmann algebras to have a fixed sequence of generators. Note that $\bigwedge_L \subset \bigwedge_{L+1}$, and taking the direct limit as $L \to \infty$, we have the *infinite Grassmann algebra* denoted by $\bigwedge_\infty$. Then $\bigwedge_L$ and $\bigwedge_\infty$ are the associative algebras over $\mathbb{C}$ with generators ζ_i, for $i = 1, 2, ..., L$ and $i = 1, 2, ...$, respectively, and with relations:

$$\zeta_i \zeta_j = -\zeta_j \zeta_i, \qquad \zeta_i^2 = 0.$$

Note that $\dim_{\mathbb{C}} \bigwedge_L = 2^L$, and if $L = 0$, then $\bigwedge_0 = \mathbb{C}$. We use the notation $\bigwedge_*$ to denote a Grassmann algebra, finite or infinite. The reason we take $\bigwedge_*$ to be over $\mathbb{C}$ is that we will mainly be interested in complex supergeometry and transition functions which are superanalytic as described below. However, formally, we could just as well have taken $\mathbb{C}$ to be any field of characteristic zero, and in fact, in Chapter 3 we will consider formal superanalytic functions over a general superalgebra.

Let

$$\begin{aligned} I_L &= \bigl\{(i) = (i_1, i_2, \ldots, i_{2n}) \mid i_1 < i_2 < \cdots < i_{2n},\ i_l \in \{1, 2, ..., L\},\ n \in \mathbb{N}\bigr\}, \\ J_L &= \bigl\{(j) = (j_1, j_2, \ldots, j_{2n+1}) \mid j_1 < j_2 < \cdots < j_{2n+1},\ j_l \in \{1, 2, ..., L\},\ n \in \mathbb{N}\bigr\}, \end{aligned}$$

and $K_L = I_L \cup J_L$. Let

$$\begin{aligned} I_\infty &= \bigl\{(i) = (i_1, i_2, \ldots, i_{2n}) \mid i_1 < i_2 < \cdots < i_{2n},\ i_l \in \mathbb{Z}_+,\ n \in \mathbb{N}\bigr\}, \\ J_\infty &= \bigl\{(j) = (j_1, j_2, \ldots, j_{2n+1}) \mid j_1 < j_2 < \cdots < j_{2n+1},\ j_l \in \mathbb{Z}_+,\ n \in \mathbb{N}\bigr\}, \end{aligned}$$

and $K_\infty = I_\infty \cup J_\infty$. We use I_*, J_*, and K_* to denote I_L or I_∞, J_L or J_∞, and K_L or K_∞, respectively. Note that $(i) = (i_1, ..., i_{2n})$ for $n = 0$ is in I_*, and we denote this element by $(\emptyset)$. The $\mathbb{Z}_2$-grading of $\bigwedge_*$ is given explicitly by

$$\begin{aligned} \textstyle\bigwedge_*^0 &= \Bigl\{a \in \textstyle\bigwedge_* \mid a = \displaystyle\sum_{(i) \in I_*} a_{(i)} \zeta_{i_1} \zeta_{i_2} \cdots \zeta_{i_{2n}},\ a_{(i)} \in \mathbb{C},\ n \in \mathbb{N}\Bigr\} \\ \textstyle\bigwedge_*^1 &= \Bigl\{a \in \textstyle\bigwedge_* \mid a = \displaystyle\sum_{(j) \in J_*} a_{(j)} \zeta_{j_1} \zeta_{j_2} \cdots \zeta_{j_{2n+1}},\ a_{(j)} \in \mathbb{C},\ n \in \mathbb{N}\Bigr\}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that $a^2 = 0$ for all $a \in \bigwedge_*^1$.

We can also decompose $\bigwedge_*$ into *body*, $(\bigwedge_*)_B = \{a_{(\emptyset)} \in \mathbb{C}\}$, and *soul*

$$(\textstyle\bigwedge_*)_S = \Bigl\{a \in \textstyle\bigwedge_* \mid a = \displaystyle\sum_{\substack{(k) \in K_* \\ k \neq (\emptyset)}} a_{(k)} \zeta_{k_1} \zeta_{k_2} \cdots \zeta_{k_n},\ a_{(k)} \in \mathbb{C}\Bigr\}$$

subspaces such that $\bigwedge_* = (\bigwedge_*)_B \oplus (\bigwedge_*)_S$. For $a \in \bigwedge_*$, we write $a = a_B + a_S$ for its body and soul decomposition. Note that for all $a \in \bigwedge_L$, we have $a_S^{L+1} = 0$. However, no such general nilpotency condition holds for the soul of $a \in \bigwedge_\infty$, i.e., there exist $a \in \bigwedge_\infty$ such that $a_S^n \neq 0$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

Let U be a subset of $\bigwedge_*$, and write $U = U^0 \oplus U^1$ for the decomposition of U into even and odd subspaces. Let z be an even variable in U^0, i.e., an indeterminate element of U^0, and let θ be an odd variable in U^1, i.e., an indeterminate element of U^1. Here we would like to stress that in this context "variable" does not mean formal variable. We will call a map

$$\begin{array}{rcl} H : U & \longrightarrow & \bigwedge_* \\ (z, \theta) & \mapsto & H(z, \theta) \end{array}$$

a $\bigwedge_*$*-superfunction in (1,1)-variables on* U. Any such superfunction $H(z, \theta)$ can be decomposed as

$$H(z,\theta) = \Bigg(\sum_{(i) \in I_*} H_{(i)}(z,\theta)\zeta_{i_1}\zeta_{i_2}\cdots\zeta_{i_{2n}}, \sum_{(j)\in J_*} H_{(j)}(z,\theta)\zeta_{j_1}\zeta_{j_2}\cdots\zeta_{j_{2n+1}} \Bigg) \tag{2.3}$$

where each $H_{(k)}(z, \theta) : U \longrightarrow \mathbb{C}$ is a complex function on U in terms of the $z_{(i)}$'s and $\theta_{(j)}$'s, for $(k) \in K_*$, $(i) \in I_*$, and $(j) \in J_*$. We will often use the notation $H(z, \theta) = (\tilde{z}, \tilde{\theta})$ for the decomposition in (2.3) and will call $\tilde{z}$ (resp., $\tilde{\theta}$) an *even* (resp., *odd*) *superfunction* on U. We will also occasionally use the notation $H(z, \theta) = (H^0(z, \theta), H^1(z, \theta))$ for the decomposition of H into even and odd superfunctions. The set of $\bigwedge_*$-superfunctions in (1,1)-variables on a fixed set U is a superalgebra in the obvious way. We call the complex valued function $H_B(z, \theta) = H_{(\emptyset)}(z, \theta)$ defined on U the *body* of H and $H_S(z, \theta) = H(z, \theta) - H_B(z, \theta)$ the *soul* of H. Note that if $H(z, \theta)$ is a $\bigwedge_*$-superfunction in (1,1)-variables on U, then $H_B(z, \theta)$ and $H_S(z, \theta)$ are also $\bigwedge_*$-superfunctions in (1,1)-variables on U.

This notion of superfunction in $(1, 1)$-variables can be extended in the obvious way to the notion of a $\bigwedge_*$-superfunction in (m, n)-variables, i.e., in $m \in \mathbb{N}$ even variables and $n \in \mathbb{N}$ odd variables.

Remark 2.3. The second "1" in the expression "$(1, 1)$-variables" refers to the number of odd variables and is exactly the number "$N = 1$" in the expression "$N = 1$ superconformal field theory". We also remark that we are following the conventions in the literature (cf. [**Fd**], [**Bc2**]) in calling an even variable z and an odd variable θ. We caution that this may lead the reader to think of z as being merely a complex variable. This is far from the case since in fact $z \in \bigwedge_*^0$. Recall that we use the notation z_B or $z_{(\emptyset)}$ to denote the complex portion of the variable z, but z itself represents either a complex 2^{L-1}-tuple if $\bigwedge_* = \bigwedge_L$, or an infinite number of complex variables, $z_{(i)}$, for $(i) \in I_\infty$, if $\bigwedge_* = \bigwedge_\infty$. If one wishes to restrict to the nonsuper case, one should think of setting all odd variables equal to zero and the soul portion of all even variables equal to zero, thus leaving the "body" portion of the theory giving the nonsuper case.

In developing a notion of superanalyticity, we would like to say that a $\bigwedge_*$-superfunction H is "superanalytic" in an open set $U \subseteq \bigwedge_*$ in an appropriately defined topology on $\bigwedge_*$ if the appropriately defined partial derivatives $\frac{\partial}{\partial\theta}H$ and $\frac{\partial}{\partial z}H$ exist and are well defined on U. For $\bigwedge_* = \bigwedge_\infty$ the conditions needed on H for these partials to exist in a subset of $\bigwedge_\infty$ which is open in an appropriately defined topology are very straightforward. However, for a $\bigwedge_L$-superfunction, there can be unwanted cancellation for the odd variables. For example, if $\theta \in \bigwedge_L^1$ is an odd variable, and $a = \zeta_1\zeta_2 \cdots \zeta_L \in \bigwedge_L$ is a fixed supernumber, then the superfunction θa is identically zero, and thus the partial with respect to θ of this superfunction on the one hand should be a, and on the otherhand should be zero. This illustrates the fact that for $\frac{\partial}{\partial\theta}H$ to be well defined for H a $\bigwedge_L$-superfunction, some conditions on H must be imposed. One of these conditions is that the Grassmann algebra $\bigwedge_L$ be large enough and the coefficients of the supervariables in H restricted to a suitable subspace so that this unwanted cancellation does not occur (cf. [**D**], [**Bc1**], [**Ro2**], [**CR**], [**B1**]). In fact, one needs the underlying Grassmann algebra to be generated by a vector space of dimension equal to or greater than the number of odd variables so that one can restrict the coefficients of the power series expansion of a $\bigwedge_L$-superfunction so as to not contain one of the underlying basis elements ζ_i, $i = 1, ...L$, for each of the odd variables. That is, if the number of odd variables is $N \in \mathbb{N}$ and well-defined partial derivatives as well as multiple partial derivatives with respect to these odd variables are desired, then the underlying Grassmann algebra must be defined over a vector space of dimension L where L is greater than or equal to N and the coefficients in the power series expansion of the superfunction must be restricted to a subspace isomorphic to $\bigwedge_{L-N}$.

Since the motivation for this work is $N = 1$ superconformal field theory in which the fields are $N = 1$ superanalytic superfunctions and the symmetries of the theory are $N = 1$ superconformal transformations, one might expect that we need only require $L \geq 1$. However, in this paper, we will be interested in having well-defined partials for an infinite number of odd variables. This is because the moduli space of $(1, 1)$-dimensional superspheres with tubes has an infinite number of odd coordinates (see Remark 2.14). In Chapter 4, we will consider the supermeromorphic tangent space of this moduli space and partials with respect to the moduli space coordinates. In order to differentiate with respect to all these variables with abandon, we must work over an infinite Grassmann algebra, (although in practice, we never take more than two partials in a row). Thus starting in Section 2.5, for simplicity, we will begin working over $\bigwedge_\infty$, and until then, we continue to use a finite or infinite Grassmann algebra $\bigwedge_*$ noting the restrictions as needed.

Before defining superanalyticity, we define what it means for a complex analytic function to be defined for an even element of $\bigwedge_*$. Let z_B be a complex variable and $h(z_B)$ a complex analytic function in some open set $U_B \subset \mathbb{C}$. For z a variable in $\bigwedge_*^0$, we define

$$h(z) = \sum_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \frac{z_S^n}{n!} h^{(n)}(z_B), \tag{2.4}$$

i.e., $h(z)$ is the Taylor expansion about the body of $z = z_B + z_S$. Then $h(z)$ is well defined (i.e., convergent) in the open neighborhood $\{z = z_B + z_S \in \bigwedge_*^0 \mid z_B \in U_B\} \subseteq \bigwedge_*^0$. This is because for $n \in \mathbb{N}$, z_S^n has terms involving at least $2n$ of the ζ_i's. Thus any $\zeta_{i_1} \cdots \zeta_{i_{2m}}$ coefficient in (2.4) will be a finite sum. Since $h(z)$ is algebraic in each $z_{(i)}$, for $(i) \in I_*$, it follows that $h(z)$ is complex analytic in each of the complex variables $z_{(i)}$.

For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we introduce the notation $\bigwedge_{*>n}$ to denote a finite Grassmann algebra $\bigwedge_L$ with $L > n$ or an infinite Grassmann algebra. We will use the corresponding index notations for the corresponding indexing sets $I_{*>n}$, $J_{*>n}$ and $K_{*>n}$.

Definition 2.4. A *superanalytic* $\bigwedge_{*>0}$*-superfunction in* $(1,1)$*-variables* H is a $\bigwedge_{*>0}$-superfunction in $(1,1)$-variables of the form

$$\begin{aligned} H(z,\theta) &= (f(z)+\theta\xi(z), \psi(z)+\theta g(z)) \\ &= \Bigg(\sum_{(i)\in I_{*-1}} f_{(i)}(z)\zeta_{i_1}\zeta_{i_2}\cdots\zeta_{i_n} + \theta \sum_{(j)\in J_{*-1}} \xi_{(j)}(z)\zeta_{j_1}\zeta_{j_2}\cdots\zeta_{j_{2n+1}}, \\ &\qquad \sum_{(j)\in J_{*-1}} \psi_{(j)}(z)\zeta_{j_1}\zeta_{j_2}\cdots\zeta_{j_{2n+1}} + \theta \sum_{(i)\in I_{*-1}} g_{(i)}(z)\zeta_{i_1}\zeta_{i_2}\cdots\zeta_{i_n} \Bigg) \end{aligned}$$

where $f_{(i)}(z_B)$, $g_{(i)}(z_B)$, $\xi_{(j)}(z_B)$, and $\psi_{(j)}(z_B)$ are all complex analytic in some non-empty open subset $U_B \subseteq \mathbb{C}$.

The restriction of the coefficients of the $f_{(i)}(z)$'s, $g_{(i)}(z)$'s, $\xi_{(j)}(z)$'s, and $\psi_{(j)}(z)$'s to $\bigwedge_{*-1} \subseteq \bigwedge_{*>0}$ is so that the partial with respect to θ of H (as defined below) is well defined. Actually, we could restrict the coefficients to be in any Grassmann subalgebra of $\bigwedge_{*>0}$ on $*-1$ generators, but for simplicity we will follow the convention of restricting to $\bigwedge_{*-1}$ (cf. [**Ro2**]). If $\bigwedge_{*>0} = \bigwedge_\infty$, then $\bigwedge_{*-n} = \bigwedge_\infty$.

Note that if each $f_{(i)}(z_B)$, $g_{(i)}(z_B)$, $\xi_{(j)}(z_B)$, and $\psi_{(j)}(z_B)$ is complex analytic in $U_B \subseteq \mathbb{C}$, then $f_{(i)}(z)$, $g_{(i)}(z)$, $\xi_{(j)}(z)$, and $\psi_{(j)}(z)$ are all well defined in $\{z = z_B + z_S \in \bigwedge_{*>0}^0 \mid z_B \in U_B\}$. Thus $H(z,\theta)$ is well defined (i.e., convergent) for $\{(z,\theta) \in \bigwedge_{*>0} \mid z_B \in U_B\} = U_B \times (\bigwedge_{*>0})_S = U$. Consider the topology on $\bigwedge_{*>0}$ given by the product of the usual topology on $(\bigwedge_{*>0})_B = \mathbb{C}$ and the trivial topology on $(\bigwedge_{*>0})_S$. This topology on $\bigwedge_{*>0}$ is called the *DeWitt topology.* The natural domain of any superanalytic $\bigwedge_{*>0}$-superfunction is an open set in the DeWitt topology on $\bigwedge_{*>0}$.

We define the (left) partial derivatives $\frac{\partial}{\partial z}$ and $\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta}$ acting on superfunctions which are superanalytic in some DeWitt open neighborhood U of $(z,\theta) \in \bigwedge_{*>0}$ by

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta z \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial z} H(z,\theta) \right) + O((\Delta z)^2) &= H(z+\Delta z, \theta) - H(z,\theta) \\ \Delta\theta \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} H(z,\theta) \right) &= H(z, \theta+\Delta\theta) - H(z,\theta) \end{aligned}$$

for all $\Delta z \in \bigwedge_{*>0}^0$ and $\Delta\theta \in \bigwedge_{*>0}^1$ such that $z + \Delta z \in U^0 = U_B \times (\bigwedge_{*>0}^0)_S$ and $\theta + \Delta\theta \in U^1 = \bigwedge_{*>0}^1$. See for example [**B1**] for a proof and discussion of the fact that these partials are in fact well defined. Note that $\frac{\partial}{\partial z}$ and $\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta}$ are endomorphisms of the superalgebra of superanalytic $(1,1)$-superfunctions, and in fact, are even and odd superderivations, respectively.

Let $(\bigwedge_*)^\times$ denote the set of invertible elements in $\bigwedge_*$. Then

$$(\textstyle\bigwedge_*)^\times = \{a \in \bigwedge_* \mid a_B \neq 0\}$$

since

$$\frac{1}{a} = \frac{1}{a_B + a_S} = \sum_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \frac{(-1)^n a_S^n}{a_B^{n+1}}$$

is well defined if and only if $a_B \neq 0$. In light of this fact, note that the DeWitt topology on $\bigwedge_*$ is non-Hausdorff. Two points $a, b \in \bigwedge_*$ can be separated by disjoint open sets in the DeWitt topology if and only if $a_B \neq b_B$, i.e., if and only if their difference is an invertible element of $\bigwedge_*$. In other words, the DeWitt topology fails to be Hausdorff exactly to the extent that the nonzero elements of $\bigwedge_*$ fail in general to be invertible.

If $h(z_B)$ is complex analytic in an open neighborhood of the complex plane, then $h(z_B)$ has a Laurent series expansion in z_B, given by $h(z_B) = \sum_{l\in\mathbb{Z}} c_l z_B^l$, for $c_l \in \mathbb{C}$, and we have

$$\begin{aligned} h(z) &= \sum_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \frac{z_S^n}{n!} h^{(n)}(z_B) = \sum_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \sum_{l\in\mathbb{Z}} c_l \frac{l!}{n!(l-n)!} z_S^n z_B^{l-n} \\ &= \sum_{l\in\mathbb{Z}} c_l (z_B + z_S)^l = \sum_{l\in\mathbb{Z}} c_l z^l \end{aligned} \tag{2.5}$$

where $(z_B + z_S)^l$, for $l \in \mathbb{Z}$, is always understood to mean expansion in positive powers of the second variable, in this case z_S. Thus if H is a $\bigwedge_{*>0}$-superfunction in $(1,1)$-variables which is superanalytic in a (DeWitt) open neighborhood, H can be expanded as

$$H(z,\theta) = \left(\sum_{l\in\mathbb{Z}} a_l z^l + \theta \sum_{l\in\mathbb{Z}} n_l z^l, \sum_{l\in\mathbb{Z}} m_l z^l + \theta \sum_{l\in\mathbb{Z}} b_l z^l \right) \tag{2.6}$$

for $a_l, b_l \in \bigwedge_{*-1}^0$ and $m_l, n_l \in \bigwedge_{*-1}^1$.

In Chapter 4, we will encounter superanalytic superfunctions in more than one even and more than one odd variable. Let $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$, and let U be a subset of $(\bigwedge_*^0)^m \oplus (\bigwedge_*^1)^n$. A $\bigwedge_*$-superfunction H on U in (m,n)-variables is given by

$$\begin{aligned} H : U &\longrightarrow \bigwedge\nolimits_* \\ (z_1, z_2, ..., z_m, \theta_1, \theta_2, ..., \theta_n) &\mapsto H(z_1, z_2, ..., z_m, \theta_1, \theta_2, ..., \theta_n) \end{aligned}$$

where z_k, for $k = 1, ..., m$, are even variables in $\bigwedge_*^0$ and θ_k, for $k = 1, ..., n$, are odd variables in $\bigwedge_*^1$. Let $f((z_1)_B, (z_2)_B, ..., (z_m)_B)$ be a complex analytic function in $(z_k)_B$, for $k = 1, ..., m$. For $z_k \in \bigwedge_*^0$, and $k = 1, .., m$, define

$$\begin{aligned} f(z_1, z_2, ..., z_m) = \sum_{l_1,...,l_m\in\mathbb{N}} & \frac{(z_1)_S^{l_1} (z_2)_S^{l_2} \cdots (z_m)_S^{l_m}}{l_1! l_2! \cdots l_m!} \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial (z_1)_B} \right)^{l_1} \cdot \\ & \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial (z_2)_B} \right)^{l_2} \cdots \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial (z_m)_B} \right)^{l_m} \cdot f((z_1)_B, (z_2)_B, ..., (z_m)_B). \end{aligned} \tag{2.7}$$

DEFINITION 2.5. Let $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $U \subset (\bigwedge_{*>n-1}^0)^m \oplus (\bigwedge_{*>n-1}^1)^n$, and let H be a $\bigwedge_{*>n-1}$-superfunction in (m,n)-variables defined on U. Let

$$\begin{aligned} A_n^0 &= \{(k) = (k_1, k_2, ..., k_{2l}) \mid l \in \mathbb{N},\ k_j \in \{1, ..., n\},\ k_1 < k_2 < \cdots k_{2l}\} \\ A_n^1 &= \{(k) = (k_1, k_2, ..., k_{2l+1}) \mid l \in \mathbb{N},\ k_j \in \{1, ..., n\},\ k_1 < k_2 < \cdots k_{2l+1}\}. \end{aligned}$$

Then H is said to be *superanalytic* if H is of the form

$$\begin{aligned} & H(z_1, z_2, ..., z_m, \theta_1, \theta_2, ..., \theta_n) \\ &= \Bigg(\sum_{(k)\in A_n^0} \theta_{k_1} \cdots \theta_{k_{2l}} f_{(k)}(z_1, z_2, ..., z_m) + \sum_{(k)\in A_n^1} \theta_{k_1} \cdots \theta_{k_{2l+1}} \xi_{(k)}(z_1, z_2, ..., z_m), \\ & \qquad \sum_{(k)\in A_n^0} \theta_{k_1} \cdots \theta_{k_{2l}} \psi_{(k)}(z_1, z_2, ..., z_m) + \sum_{(k)\in A_n^1} \theta_{k_1} \cdots \theta_{k_{2l+1}} g_{(k)}(z_1, z_2, ..., z_m) \Bigg), \end{aligned}$$

where each $f_{(k)}$ and $g_{(k)}$ is of the form

$$f_{(k)}(z_1, z_2, ..., z_m) = \sum_{(i)\in I_{*-n}} f_{(k),(i)}(z_1, z_2, ..., z_m)\zeta_{i_1}\zeta_{i_2}\cdots\zeta_{i_{2s}},$$

each $\xi_{(k)}$ and $\psi_{(k)}$ is of the form

$$\xi_{(k)}(z_1, z_2, ..., z_m) = \sum_{(j)\in J_{*-n}} \xi_{(k),(j)}(z_1, z_2, ..., z_m)\zeta_{j_1}\zeta_{j_2}\cdots\zeta_{j_{2s+1}},$$

and each $f_{(k),(i)}((z_1)_B, (z_2)_B, ..., (z_m)_B)$, $\xi_{(k),(j)}((z_1)_B, (z_2)_B, ..., (z_m)_B)$, $\psi_{(k),(j)}((z_1)_B, (z_2)_B, ..., (z_m)_B)$, and $g_{(k),(i)}((z_1)_B, (z_2)_B, ..., (z_m)_B)$ is analytic in $(z_l)_B$, for $l = 1, ..., m$, and $((z_1)_B, (z_2)_B, ..., (z_m)_B) \in U_B \subset \mathbb{C}^m$.

We require the even and odd variables to be in $\bigwedge_{*>n-1}$, and we restrict the coefficients of the $f_{(k),(i)}$'s, $\xi_{(k),(j)}$'s, $\psi_{(k),(j)}$'s, and $g_{(k),(i)}$'s to be in $\bigwedge_{*-n} \subseteq \bigwedge_{*>n-1}$ in order for the partial derivatives with respect to each of the n odd variables to be well defined and for multiple partials to be well defined. As in the $(m,n) = (1,1)$ case, we could merely require the coefficients to be in any Grassmann subalgebra of $\bigwedge_{*>n-1}$ on $*-n$ generators, but for simplicity we instead restrict to $\bigwedge_{*-n}$.

Consider the projection

$$\begin{array}{rcl} \pi_B^{(m,n)} : (\bigwedge_{*>n-1}^0)^m \oplus (\bigwedge_{*>n-1}^1)^n & \longrightarrow & \mathbb{C}^m \\ (z_1, ..., z_m, \theta_1, ..., \theta_n) & \mapsto & ((z_1)_B, (z_2)_B, ..., (z_m)_B). \end{array} \tag{2.8}$$

We define the *DeWitt topology on* $(\bigwedge_{*>n-1}^0)^m \oplus (\bigwedge_{*>n-1}^1)^n$ by letting

$$U \subseteq ((\bigwedge_{*>n-1}^0)^m \oplus (\bigwedge_{*>n-1}^1)^n)$$

be an open set in the DeWitt topology if and only if $U = (\pi_B^{(m,n)})^{-1}(V)$ for some open set $V \subseteq \mathbb{C}^m$. Note that the natural domain of a superanalytic $\bigwedge_{*>n-1}$-superfunction in (m,n)-variables is an open set in the DeWitt topology.

A superconformal field theory based on "superfields" which are superanalytic superfunctions in $(1,n)$-variables would be referred to as an "$N = n$ superconformal field theory".

Remark 2.6. Recall that $\bigwedge_L \subset \bigwedge_{L+1}$ for $L \in \mathbb{N}$, and note that from (2.7), any superanalytic $\bigwedge_L$-superfunction, H_L, in (m,n)-variables for $L \geq n$ can naturally be extended to a superanalytic $\bigwedge_{L'}$-superfunction in (m,n)-variables for $L' > L$ and hence to a superanalytic $\bigwedge_\infty$-superfunction. Conversely, if $H_{L'}$ is a superanalytic $\bigwedge_{L'}$-superfunction (or $\bigwedge_\infty$-superfunction) in (m,n)-variables for $L' > n$, then we can restrict $H_{L'}$ to a superanalytic $\bigwedge_L$-superfunction for $L' > L \geq n$ by restricting $(z_1, ...z_m, , \theta_1, ..., \theta_n) \in (\bigwedge_L^0)^m \oplus (\bigwedge_L^1)^n$ and setting $f_{(k),(i)} \equiv g_{(k),(i)} \equiv 0$ if $(i) \notin I_{L-n}$ and $\xi_{(k),(j)} \equiv \psi_{(k),(j)} \equiv 0$ if $(j) \notin J_{L-n}$.

2.2. Superconformal $(1,1)$-superfunctions and power series

Let z be an even variable in $\bigwedge_{*>0}^0$ and θ an odd variable in $\bigwedge_{*>0}^1$. Following [**Fd**], define D to be the odd superderivation $D = \frac{\partial}{\partial\theta} + \theta\frac{\partial}{\partial z}$ acting on $\bigwedge_{*>0}$-superfunctions in $(1,1)$-variables which are superanalytic in some DeWitt open subset $U \subseteq \bigwedge_{*>0}$. Then $D^2 = \frac{\partial}{\partial z}$, and if $H(z,\theta) = (\tilde{z}, \tilde{\theta})$ is superanalytic in some DeWitt open subset $U \subseteq \bigwedge_{*>0}$, then D transforms under $H(z,\theta)$ by

$$D = (D\tilde{\theta})\tilde{D} + (D\tilde{z} - \tilde{\theta}D\tilde{\theta})\tilde{D}^2 \tag{2.9}$$

where $\tilde{D} = \frac{\partial}{\partial \tilde{\theta}} + \tilde{\theta}\frac{\partial}{\partial \tilde{z}}$ with $\frac{\partial}{\partial \tilde{z}}$ and $\frac{\partial}{\partial \tilde{\theta}}$ defined by

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial z} = \frac{\partial \tilde{z}}{\partial z}\frac{\partial}{\partial \tilde{z}} + \frac{\partial \tilde{\theta}}{\partial z}\frac{\partial}{\partial \tilde{\theta}} \qquad \text{and} \qquad \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} = \frac{\partial \tilde{z}}{\partial \theta}\frac{\partial}{\partial \tilde{z}} + \frac{\partial \tilde{\theta}}{\partial \theta}\frac{\partial}{\partial \tilde{\theta}}.$$

Recall that a complex function f defined on an open set U_B in $\mathbb{C}$, of one complex variable z_B, is conformal in U_B if and only if $\frac{d}{dz_B}f(z_B)$ exists for $z_B \in U_B$ and is not identically zero in U_B, i.e., if and only if $f(z_B) = \tilde{z}_B$ transforms $\frac{d}{dz_B}$ by $\frac{d}{dz_B} = f'(z_B)\frac{d}{d\tilde{z}_B}$ for f' not identically zero. Such a transformation of $\frac{d}{dz_B}$ is said to be *homogeneous of degree one*, i.e., f transforms $\frac{d}{dz_B}$ by a non-zero analytic function times $\frac{d}{d\tilde{z}_B}$ to the first power with no higher order terms in $\frac{d}{d\tilde{z}_B}$. Analogously we define a superconformal superfunction on a DeWitt open subset U of $\bigwedge_{*>0}$ to be a superanalytic superfunction H under which D transforms homogeneously of degree one in U. That is, H transforms D by a non-zero superanalytic superfunction times $\tilde{D}$ to the first power, and no higher terms in $\tilde{D}$. Since a superanalytic function $H(z,\theta) = (\tilde{z}, \tilde{\theta})$ transforms D according to (2.9), H is superconformal if and only if, in addition to being superanalytic, H satisfies

$$D\tilde{z} - \tilde{\theta}D\tilde{\theta} = 0, \tag{2.10}$$

for $D\tilde{\theta}$ not identically zero, thus transforming D by $D = (D\tilde{\theta})\tilde{D}$. If $H(z,\theta) = (f(z) + \theta\xi(z), \psi(z) + \theta g(z))$, then the condition (2.10) is equivalent to the conditions

$$\xi = g\psi, \quad \text{and} \quad g^2 = f' + \psi\psi', \tag{2.11}$$

with $D\tilde{\theta} = g(z) + \theta\psi'(z)$ not identically zero. Thus a superconformal function H is uniquely determined by $f(z)$, $\psi(z)$ and a choice of a well-defined square root for the function $f' + \psi\psi'$, and H must have the form

$$H(z,\theta) = \Big(f(z) + \theta\psi(z)\sqrt{f'(z) + \psi(z)\psi'(z)}, \qquad \psi(z) + \theta\sqrt{f'(z) + \psi(z)\psi'(z)}\Big), \tag{2.12}$$

with f' or ψ' not identically zero. Note that $\sqrt{f' + \psi\psi'}$ is a solution to (2.11), if and only if $-\sqrt{f' + \psi\psi'}$ is also a solution. Thus H given by (2.12) is superconformal, if and only if $H(z,-\theta)$ is superconformal. Hence for every even superfunction f and odd superfunction ψ with $f' + \psi\psi' \neq 0$ and with a given well-defined square root for $f' + \psi\psi'$, there are exactly two distinct superconformal functions H satisfying $\theta H(z,\theta) = \theta(f(z), \psi(z))$.

By definition, if $f_B'(z_B) \neq 0$ then $\sqrt{f'(z) + \psi(z)\psi'(z)}$ is the Taylor expansion of the square root about $f_B'(z_B)$, and thus a well-defined square root for $f' + \psi\psi'$ only depends on a well-defined square root for $f_B'(z_B)$. In addition, in the case $f'(z) \neq 0$, since the square of any odd superfunction is zero, (2.12) can be simplified to

$$H(z,\theta) = \Big(f(z) + \theta\psi(z)\sqrt{f'(z)}, \psi(z) + \theta\sqrt{f'(z) + \psi(z)\psi'(z)}\Big). \tag{2.13}$$

Remark 2.7. By "square root of $f' + \psi\psi'$", we mean a solution to (2.11) and not necessarily a square root defined for some open subset of $\bigwedge_*$. For instance, $H(z,\theta) = (z^3/3, \theta z)$ and $H(z,\theta) = (z^3/3, -\theta z)$ are both superconformal for $(z,\theta) \in \bigwedge_{*>0}$, i.e., z is a valid solution to $\sqrt{z^2}$, as is $-z$. We could also choose a branch cut for the complex logarithm, thus defining a square root in the complex plane, and then let $H(z,\theta) = (z^3/3, \theta\sqrt{z^2})$ where $\sqrt{z^2}$ is the Taylor expansion about z_B using this complex square root. However, then H is superconformal only for supernumbers with body in the complement of the branch cut being used. For instance, H would not be superconformal in a neighborhood of $0 \in \bigwedge_{*>0}$.

Note that the space of superconformal functions on $\bigwedge_{*>0}$ is closed under composition when defined. However, the sum of two superconformal functions is not in general superconformal.

Remark 2.8. The above notion of superconformal is based on the operator $D = \frac{\partial}{\partial\theta} + \theta\frac{\partial}{\partial z}$. But the crucial property of D is that it satisfies $D^2 = \frac{\partial}{\partial z}$. Thus we could just as well have used the operator $D_s = s\frac{\partial}{\partial\theta} + \frac{1}{s}\theta\frac{\partial}{\partial z}$ for any $s \in (\bigwedge_{*-1}^0)^\times$ for $(z,\theta) \in \bigwedge_{*>0}$. This is equivalent to transforming θ by $\theta \leftrightarrow \frac{1}{s}\theta$. Then a D_s-superconformal superfunction H_s is of the form

$$H_s(z,\theta) = \left(f(z) + \frac{1}{s}\theta\psi(z)\sqrt{f'(z)}, \psi(z) + \frac{1}{s}\theta\sqrt{f'(z) + \psi(z)\psi'(z)} \right), \tag{2.14}$$

for f and ψ superanalytic in z. Note that given a D_s-superconformal function H_s, the transformation $s \leftrightarrow -s$ transforms the square root of $f' + \psi\psi'$ that H_s defines to the corresponding negative square root and visa versa. Thus (2.14) can be thought of as defining a continuous deformation from a superconformal function $H_{s=1}(z,\theta)$ using a given well-defined square root of $f' + \psi\psi'$ to the superconformal function $H_{s=-1}(z,\theta) = H_{s=1}(z,-\theta)$ using the negative of this square root. This deformation and the issue of alternate notions of superconformality will be studied in a subsequent paper.

In Section 2.4, we will study "super-Riemann spheres with punctures and local superconformal coordinates vanishing at the punctures". These punctures can be thought of as being at $0 \in \bigwedge_{*>0}$, a non-zero point in $\bigwedge_{*>0}$, or at a distinguished point on the supersphere we denote by "∞". As will be shown in Section 2.4, we can always shift a non-zero point in $\bigwedge_{*>0}$ (or on the super-Riemann sphere) to zero via a global superconformal transformation. Thus all local superconformal coordinates vanishing at the punctures can be expressed as power series vanishing at zero or vanishing as $(z,\theta) = (z_B + z_S, \theta) \longrightarrow (\infty + 0, 0) = \infty$.

If the puncture is at zero, we are interested in invertible superconformal functions $H(z,\theta)$ defined in a neighborhood of zero vanishing at zero. Such an H is of the form (2.13) where $f(z)$ and $\psi(z)$ are even and odd superanalytic functions, respectively, with $f(0) = 0$, $f'(0) \in \bigwedge_{*-1}^\times$ and $\psi(0) = 0$. Thus by (2.5), f and ψ can be expanded as

$$\begin{aligned} f(z) &= \sum_{j\in\mathbb{N}} a_j z^{j+1}, \qquad \text{for } a_j \in \textstyle\bigwedge_{*-1}^0 \text{ and } a_0 \in (\bigwedge_{*-1}^0)^\times, \\ \psi(z) &= \sum_{j\in\mathbb{N}} m_j z^{j+1}, \qquad \text{for } m_j \in \textstyle\bigwedge_{*-1}^1. \end{aligned}$$

Then by (2.11),

$$g^2(z) = \sum_{j\in\mathbb{N}} a_j(j+1)z^j + \sum_{j,k\in\mathbb{N}} m_j m_k (k+1) z^{j+k+1}.$$

The condition that a_0 be invertible is necessary and sufficient for H to be invertible in a neighborhood of zero, and in this case, we can factor a_0 out of the expression above so that

$$g^2(z) = a_0\Big(1 + \sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+} \frac{a_j}{a_0}(j+1)z^j + \sum_{j,k\in\mathbb{N}} \frac{m_j m_k}{a_0}(k+1)z^{j+k+1}\Big). \tag{2.15}$$

Fix a branch of the complex logarithm, and let $\sqrt{(a_0)_B}$ be the corresponding square root of $(a_0)_B$. Then solving (2.15), we have

$$g(z) = \pm\sqrt{a_0}\Big(1 + \sum_{j\in\mathbb{N}} c_j z^{j+1}\Big)$$

where $1 + \sum_{j\in\mathbb{N}} c_j z^{j+1}$ is the expansion about zero of the square root of the term in parenthesis on the right-hand side of (2.15) using the principal branch of log, and $\sqrt{a_0}$ is by definition the expansion about $\sqrt{(a_0)_B}$.

Thus if H is superconformal and invertible in a neighborhood of zero, and vanishing at zero, H can be expanded as

$$\begin{aligned} H(z,\theta) = \Bigg(&\sum_{j\in\mathbb{N}} a_j z^{j+1} + \theta a_\square(\sum_{j\in\mathbb{N}} m_j z^{j+1})(1 + \sum_{j\in\mathbb{N}} c_j z^{j+1}), \\ &\qquad\qquad \sum_{j\in\mathbb{N}} m_j z^{j+1} + \theta a_\square(1 + \sum_{j\in\mathbb{N}} c_j z^{j+1})\Bigg) \end{aligned} \tag{2.16}$$

where $a_\square \in (\bigwedge_{*-1}^0)^\times$ such that $a_\square^2 = a_0$. In other words, a superconformal function vanishing at zero and invertible in a neighborhood of zero is uniquely determined by $\sum_{j\in\mathbb{N}} a_j z^{j+1}$, $\sum_{j\in\mathbb{N}} m_j z^{j+1}$ and $a_\square \in (\bigwedge_{*-1}^0)^\times$ satisfying $a_\square^2 = a_0$. Note that by giving the data $a_\square \in (\bigwedge_{*-1}^0)^\times$, we need not specify a branch of the complex logarithm.

REMARK 2.9. In [**B1**] and [**B2**], instead of specifying $a_\square \in (\bigwedge_{*-1}^0)^\times$ such that $a_\square^2 = a_0$ in the data describing a power series about zero, we fixed a branch cut for the complex logarithm and then specified whether we were using the positive or negative square root with respect to this branch cut for the square root of a_0. However, it is more natural to not specify a square root and instead specify the value of $a_\square$ whose square is a_0. We take this more natural approach throughout this paper.

Similarly, we would like to express a superconformal function vanishing as $(z,\theta) \to (\infty, 0) = \infty$ as a power series in z and θ. The superfunction

$$\begin{aligned} I : \textstyle\bigwedge_{*>0}^\times &\longrightarrow \textstyle\bigwedge_{*>0}^\times \\ (z,\theta) &\mapsto \Big(\frac{1}{z}, \frac{i\theta}{z}\Big) \end{aligned}$$

is superconformal, well defined and vanishing as $(z,\theta) \to \infty$. In fact, H is superconformal, well defined and invertible in a neighborhood of ∞ and vanishing at ∞

if and only if $H(1/z, i\theta/z)$ is of the form (2.16), i.e.,

$$H(z,\theta) = \Bigg(\sum_{j\in\mathbb{N}} a_j z^{-j-1} + \frac{i\theta}{z} a_\square (\sum_{j\in\mathbb{N}} m_j z^{-j-1})(1 + \sum_{j\in\mathbb{N}} c_j z^{-j-1}), \\ \sum_{j\in\mathbb{N}} m_j z^{-j-1} + \frac{i\theta}{z} a_\square (1 + \sum_{j\in\mathbb{N}} c_j z^{-j-1})\Bigg) \tag{2.17}$$

where $1 + \sum_{j\in\mathbb{N}} c_j z^{-j-1}$ is the power series expansion of

$$\Big(1 + \sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+} \frac{a_j}{a_0}(j+1) z^{-j} + \sum_{j,k\in\mathbb{N}} \frac{m_j m_k}{a_0}(k+1) z^{-j-k-1}\Big)^{1/2} \tag{2.18}$$

about ∞, and $a_\square \in (\bigwedge_{*-1}^0)^\times$ such that $a_\square^2 = a_0$. Thus a superconformal function vanishing at ∞ and invertible in a neighborhood of ∞ is uniquely determined by $\sum_{j\in\mathbb{N}} a_j z^{-j-1}$, $\sum_{j\in\mathbb{N}} m_j z^{-j-1}$ and $a_\square \in (\bigwedge_{*-1}^0)^\times$ satisfying $a_\square^2 = a_0$.

2.3. Complex supermanifolds and super-Riemann surfaces

A *DeWitt* (m,n)*-dimensional topological superspace over* $\bigwedge_*$ is a topological space X with a countable basis which is locally homeomorphic to an open subset of $(\bigwedge_*^0)^m \oplus (\bigwedge_*^1)^n$ in the DeWitt topology. A *DeWitt* (m,n)*-chart on* X *over* $\bigwedge_*$ is a pair (U,Ω) such that U is an open subset of X and Ω is a homeomorphism of U onto an open subset of $(\bigwedge_*^0)^m \oplus (\bigwedge_*^1)^n$ in the DeWitt topology. A *superanalytic atlas of DeWitt* (m,n)*-charts on* X *over* $\bigwedge_{*>n-1}$ is a family of charts $\{(U_\alpha,\Omega_\alpha)\}_{\alpha\in A}$ satisfying

(i) Each U_α is open in X, and $\bigcup_{\alpha\in A} U_\alpha = X$.

(ii) Each Ω_α is a homeomorphism from U_α to a (DeWitt) open set in

$$(\textstyle\bigwedge_{*>n-1}^0)^m \oplus (\bigwedge_{*>n-1}^1)^n,$$

such that

$$\Omega_\alpha \circ \Omega_\beta^{-1} : \Omega_\beta(U_\alpha \cap U_\beta) \longrightarrow \Omega_\alpha(U_\alpha \cap U_\beta)$$

is superanalytic for all non-empty $U_\alpha \cap U_\beta$, i.e., $\Omega_\alpha \circ \Omega_\beta^{-1} = (\tilde{z}_1, ..., \tilde{z}_m, \tilde{\theta}_1, ..., \tilde{\theta}_n)$ where $\tilde{z}_i$ is an even superanalytic $\bigwedge_{*>n-1}$-superfunction in (m,n)-variables for $i = 1, ..., m$, and $\tilde{\theta}_j$ is an odd superanalytic $\bigwedge_{*>n-1}$-superfunction in (m,n)-variables for $j = 1, ..., n$.

Such an atlas is called *maximal* if, given any chart (U,Ω) such that

$$\Omega \circ \Omega_\beta^{-1} : \Omega_\beta(U \cap U_\beta) \longrightarrow \Omega(U \cap U_\beta)$$

is a superanalytic homeomorphism for all β, then $(U,\Omega) \in \{(U_\alpha,\Omega_\alpha)\}_{\alpha\in A}$.

A *DeWitt* (m,n)*-supermanifold over* $\bigwedge_{*>n-1}$ is a DeWitt (m,n)-dimensional topological space M together with a maximal superanalytic atlas of DeWitt (m,n)-charts over $\bigwedge_{*>n-1}$.

Given a DeWitt (m,n)-supermanifold M over $\bigwedge_{*>n-1}$, define an equivalence relation $\sim$ on M by letting $p \sim q$ if and only if there exists $\alpha \in A$ such that $p, q \in U_\alpha$ and $\pi_B^{(m,n)}(\Omega_\alpha(p)) = \pi_B^{(m,n)}(\Omega_\alpha(q))$ where $\pi_B^{(m,n)}$ is the projection given by (2.8). Let p_B denote the equivalence class of p under this equivalence relation. Define the *body* M_B of M to be the m-dimensional complex manifold with analytic structure given by the coordinate charts $\{((U_\alpha)_B, (\Omega_\alpha)_B)\}_{\alpha\in A}$ where $(U_\alpha)_B = \{p_B \mid p \in U_\alpha\}$, and $(\Omega_\alpha)_B : (U_\alpha)_B \longrightarrow \mathbb{C}^m$ is given by $(\Omega_\alpha)_B(p_B) = \pi_B^{(m,n)} \circ \Omega_\alpha(p)$.

Note that M is a complex fiber bundle over the complex manifold M_B. The fiber is $(\bigwedge^0_{*>n-1})^m_S \oplus (\bigwedge^1_{*>n-1})^n$, a possibly infinite-dimensional vector space over $\mathbb{C}$. This bundle is not in general a vector bundle since the transition functions are not in general linear.

For any DeWitt $(1,n)$-supermanifold M, its body M_B is a Riemann surface. A *super-Riemann surface over* $\bigwedge_{*>0}$ is a DeWitt $(1,1)$-supermanifold over $\bigwedge_{*>0}$ with coordinate atlas $\{(U_\alpha,\Omega_\alpha)\}_{\alpha\in A}$ such that the coordinate transition functions $\Omega_\alpha \circ \Omega_\beta^{-1}$ in addition to being superanalytic are also superconformal for all nonempty $U_\alpha \cap U_\beta$. Since the condition that the coordinate transition functions be superconformal instead of merely superanalytic is such a strong condition (unlike in the nonsuper case), we again stress the distinction between a supermanifold which has *superanalytic* transition functions versus a super-Riemann surface which has *superconformal* transition functions. It would be perhaps more appropriate to refer to the later as a "superconformal super-Riemann surface" in order to avoid confusion. In fact, in the literature one will find the term "super-Riemann surface" or "Riemannian supermanifold" used for both merely superanalytic structures (cf. [**D**]) and for superconformal structures (cf. [**Fd**], [**CR**]). However, we will follow the terminology of [**Fd**] and refer to a superconformal super-Riemann surface simply as a super-Riemann surface.

Next we show that if M is a DeWitt $(1,1)$-supermanifold over $\bigwedge_\infty$, then for $L \in \mathbb{N}$ we can define a DeWitt $(1,1)$-supermanifold M_L over $\bigwedge_L$ which can in some sense be thought of as a sub-supermanifold of M. In addition, we can define a DeWitt $(1,1)$-dimensional topological superspace $M_L^{\mathbb{C}}$ over $\bigwedge_L$ for $L \in \mathbb{N}$ which as a 2^L-dimensional complex manifold embeds in M.

Recall that $\bigwedge_L \subset \bigwedge_\infty$ for $L \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $\{\zeta_i\}_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ be the fixed basis for $\bigwedge_\infty$, and let $i_{L,\infty} : \bigwedge_L \longrightarrow \bigwedge_\infty$ be the inclusion map. Denote the corresponding projection by

$$\begin{array}{rcl} p_{\infty,L} : \bigwedge_\infty & \longrightarrow & \bigwedge_L \\ \zeta_i & \mapsto & \left\{ \begin{array}{lll} \zeta_i & \text{for} & i \leq L \\ 0 & \text{for} & i > L \end{array} \right. . \end{array}$$

Let H be a superanalytic $\bigwedge_\infty$-superfunction in $(1,1)$-variables defined on some DeWitt open set $U \subseteq \bigwedge_\infty$ with Laurent expansion in $z \in \bigwedge^0_\infty$ given by

$$H(z,\theta) = \sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}} a_j z^j + \theta \sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}} b_j z^j$$

for some $a_j, b_j \in \bigwedge_\infty$. Define the superanalytic $\bigwedge_L$-superfunction H_L in $(1,1)$-variables on $U_L = p_{\infty,L}(U) \subset \bigwedge_L$ by

$$H_L(z,\theta) = \sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}} p_{\infty,L-1}(a_j) z^j + \theta \sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}} p_{\infty,L-1}(b_j) z^j .$$

Let M be a DeWitt $(1,1)$-supermanifold over $\bigwedge_\infty$ with local coordinate atlas $(U_\alpha,\Omega_\alpha)_{\alpha\in A}$. Define

$$M_L = \Big(\bigsqcup_{\alpha\in A} p_{\infty,L} \circ \Omega_\alpha(U_\alpha) \Big) / \approx$$

where $p \in p_{\infty,L} \circ \Omega_\alpha(U_\alpha)$ and $q \in p_{\infty,L} \circ \Omega_\beta(U_\beta)$ are equivalent under the equivalence relation $\approx$ if and only if

$$q = (\Omega_\beta \circ \Omega_\alpha^{-1})_L(p).$$

Then M_L is a DeWitt $(1,1)$-supermanifold over $\bigwedge_L$. Note however that M_L can not in general be embedded as a submanifold of M; the coordinate transition functions of M do not restrict to M_L since $(\Omega_\beta \circ \Omega_\alpha^{-1})_L$ is not a simple restriction of $\Omega_\beta \circ \Omega_\alpha^{-1}$ to $\bigwedge_L$. If we instead form

$$M_L^{\mathbb{C}} = \Bigl(\bigsqcup_{\alpha \in A} p_{\infty,L} \circ \Omega_\alpha(U_\alpha) \Bigr) / \approx' \tag{2.19}$$

where $p \in p_{\infty,L} \circ \Omega_\alpha(U_\alpha)$ and $q \in p_{\infty,L} \circ \Omega_\beta(U_\beta)$ are equivalent under the equivalence relation $\approx'$ if and only if

$$q = p_{\infty,L} \circ \Omega_\beta \circ \Omega_\alpha^{-1} \circ i_{L,\infty}(p),$$

then $M_L^{\mathbb{C}}$ is a DeWitt $(1,1)$-dimensional topological superspace over $\bigwedge_L$ which naturally embeds into M. In addition, $M_L^{\mathbb{C}}$ is a 2^L-dimensional complex analytic manifold but is not in general a DeWitt supermanifold due to the fact that the coordinate transition functions are not in general superanalytic.

In addition to embedding into M, any $M_L^{\mathbb{C}}$ embeds into $M_{L'}^{\mathbb{C}}$ for $L, L' \in \mathbb{N}$ with $L' > L$. Thus we have an infinite sequence of complex manifolds

$$M_B = M_0^{\mathbb{C}} \hookrightarrow M_1^{\mathbb{C}} \hookrightarrow M_2^{\mathbb{C}} \hookrightarrow \cdots \hookrightarrow M_{L-1}^{\mathbb{C}} \hookrightarrow M_L^{\mathbb{C}} \hookrightarrow M_{L+1}^{\mathbb{C}} \hookrightarrow \cdots,$$

and taking the direct limit of this sequence, we recover M, the DeWitt $(1,1)$-supermanifold over $\bigwedge_\infty$ (cf. [**Ro2**]). This construction can be extended to DeWitt (m,n)-supermanifolds for general $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$ in the obvious way.

2.4. Superspheres with tubes and the sewing operation

By $N = 1$ *supersphere* we will mean a (superconformal) super-Riemann surface over $\bigwedge_{*>0}$ such that its body is a genus-zero one-dimensional connected compact complex manifold. From now on we will refer to such an object as a *supersphere*.

A *supersphere with* $1 + n$ *tubes* for $n \in \mathbb{N}$, is a supersphere S with 1 negatively oriented point p_0 and n positively oriented points $p_1, ..., p_n$ (we call them *punctures*) on S which all have distinct bodies (i.e., p_i is not equivalent to p_j for $i \neq j$ under the equivalence relation $\sim$ defined in Section 2.3) and with local superconformal coordinates $(U_0, \Omega_0), ..., (U_n, \Omega_n)$ vanishing at the punctures $p_0, ..., p_n$, respectively. We denote this structure by

$$(S; p_0, ..., p_n; (U_0, \Omega_0), ..., (U_n, \Omega_n)).$$

We will always order the punctures so that the negatively oriented puncture is p_0.

Remark 2.10. The reason we call a puncture with local superconformal coordinate vanishing at the puncture a "tube" is that such a structure is indeed superconformally equivalent to a half-infinite superconformal tube representing an incoming (resp., outgoing) "superparticle" or "superstring" if the puncture is positively (resp., negatively) oriented. For $r \in \mathbb{R}_+$, denote by

$$B_{z_B}^r = \{w_B \in \mathbb{C} \mid |w_B - z_B| < r\} \qquad (\text{resp., } \bar{B}_{z_B}^r = \{w_B \in \mathbb{C} \mid |w_B - z_B| \leq r\})$$

an open (resp., closed) ball in the complex plane about the point z_B with radius r. Denote a DeWitt open (resp., closed) ball in $\bigwedge_{*>0}$ about (z, θ) of radius r by

$$\mathcal{B}_z^r = B_{z_B}^r \times (\textstyle\bigwedge_{*>0})_S \qquad (\text{resp., } \bar{\mathcal{B}}_z^r = \bar{B}_{z_B}^r \times (\textstyle\bigwedge_{*>0})_S).$$

(Note that $\mathcal{B}_z^r$ depends only on z_B and r.) Let p be a positively oriented puncture with a local coordinate neighborhood U and superconformal local coordinate map $\Omega : U \to \bigwedge_{*>0}$ vanishing at the puncture. Then for some $r \in \mathbb{R}_+$, we can find a DeWitt open disc $\mathcal{B}_0^r$ such that $\Omega^{-1}(\mathcal{B}_0^r) \subset U$. Define the equivalence relation $\sim$ on $\bigwedge_{*>0}$ by $(z_1, \theta_1) \sim (z_2, \theta_2)$ if and only if $(z_1)_B = (z_2)_B + 2\pi i k$ for some integer k. Then the set τ_r of all equivalence classes of elements of $(z, \theta) \in \bigwedge_{*>0}$ satisfying $\mathrm{Re}(z_B) < \log r$ (where $\mathrm{Re}(z_B)$ is the real part of the complex number z_B) together with the metric induced from the DeWitt metric on $\bigwedge_{*>0}$ is a half-infinite tube in the body and is topologically trivial in the soul. Letting $H(z, \theta) = (\log z, \theta\sqrt{1/z})$, the map $q \mapsto H(\Omega(q))$ from $\Omega^{-1}(\mathcal{B}_0^r)$ to τ_r is a well-defined invertible superconformal map. A closed curve on the supersphere shrinking to p corresponds to a closed loop or "superstring" around this half-infinite super-cylinder tending towards minus infinity in the body coordinate. We can perform a similar superconformal transformation for the negative oriented puncture.

Remark 2.11. In superconformal field theory, one generally wants to consider superspheres and higher genus super-Riemann surfaces with $m \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ negatively oriented (i.e., outgoing) tubes and $n \in \mathbb{N}$ positively oriented (i.e., incoming) tubes. However, for the purposes of this work, we restrict to genus zero and $m = 1$.

Let

$$(S_1; p_0, ..., p_m; (U_0, \Omega_0), ..., (U_m, \Omega_m))$$

be a supersphere with $1 + m$ tubes, for $m \in \mathbb{N}$, and let

$$(S_2; q_0, ..., q_n; (V_0, \Xi_0), ..., (V_n, \Xi_n))$$

be a superspheres with $1 + n$ tubes, for $n \in \mathbb{N}$. A map $F : S_1 \to S_2$ will be said to be superconformal if $\Xi_\beta \circ F \circ \Omega_\alpha^{-1}$ is superconformal for all charts $(U_\alpha, \Omega_\alpha)$ of S_1, for all charts (V_β, Ξ_β) of S_2, and for all $(w, \rho) \in \Omega_\alpha(U_\alpha)$ such that $F \circ \Omega_\alpha^{-1}(w, \rho) \in V_\beta$. If $m = n$ and there is a superconformal isomorphism $F : S_1 \to S_2$ such that for each $j = 0, ..., n$, $F(p_j) = q_j$ and

$$\Omega_j|_{W_j} = \Xi_j \circ F|_{W_j} \, ,$$

for W_j some DeWitt neighborhood of p_j, then we say that these two superspheres with $1 + n$ tubes are *superconformally equivalent* and F is a *superconformal equivalence* from

$$(S_1; p_0, ..., p_n; (U_0, \Omega_0), ..., (U_n, \Omega_n))$$

to

$$(S_2; q_0, ..., q_n; (V_0, \Xi_0), ..., (V_n, \Xi_n)).$$

Thus the superconformal equivalence class of a supersphere with tubes depends only on the supersphere, the punctures, and the germs of the local coordinate maps vanishing at the punctures.

We now describe the sewing operation for two superspheres with tubes. For the bodies of the two superspheres, the sewing will be identical to the sewing operation defined in [**H1**], [**H2**] for spheres with tubes when the two superspheres can be sewn. In general, however, it is not true that if the bodies of two superspheres can be sewn then the two superspheres can be sewn since, as we shall see below, whether two superspheres (or spheres) can be sewn together depends on the radius of convergence of the local coordinates of the punctures where the sewing is taking place. But in general, the radius of convergence of a superfunction may be smaller than the radius of convergence of its body component.

Let

$$(S_1; p_0, ..., p_m; (U_0, \Omega_0), ..., (U_m, \Omega_m))$$

be a supersphere with $1+m$ tubes, for $m \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, and let

$$(S_2; q_0, ..., q_n; (V_0, \Xi_0), ..., (V_n, \Xi_n))$$

be a superspheres with $1+n$ tubes, for $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Assume that there exists a positive number r such that the closed DeWitt ball about the origin of radius r satisfies

$$\bar{\mathcal{B}}_0^r = (\bar{B}_0^r \times (\textstyle\bigwedge_{*>0})_S) \subset \Omega_i(U_i), \quad \text{for some} \quad 0 < i \leq m, \tag{2.20}$$

and the closed DeWitt ball about the origin of radius $1/r$ satisfies

$$\bar{\mathcal{B}}_0^{1/r} = (\bar{B}_0^{1/r} \times (\textstyle\bigwedge_{*>0})_S) \subset \Xi_0(V_0), \tag{2.21}$$

and also such that p_i and q_0 are the only punctures in $\Omega_i^{-1}(\bar{\mathcal{B}}_0^r)$ and $\Xi_0^{-1}(\bar{\mathcal{B}}_0^{1/r})$, respectively. In this case, we say that *the i-th puncture of the first supersphere with tubes, S_1, can be sewn with the 0-th puncture of the second supersphere with tubes, S_2*. From these two superspheres with tubes, we obtain a supersphere with $1+(m+n-1)$ tubes, i.e., with one negatively oriented tube and $m+n-1$ positively oriented tubes. We denote this supersphere by $S_1 \; {}_i\infty_0 \; S_2$, and it is obtained in the following way:

(i) By (2.20) and (2.21), there exist $r_1, r_2 \in \mathbb{R}_+$ satisfying $0 < r_2 < r < r_1$ such that $\bar{\mathcal{B}}_0^{r_1} \subset \Omega_i(U_i)$ and $\bar{\mathcal{B}}_0^{1/r_2} \subset \Xi_0(V_0)$. Then the DeWitt open subsets $S_1 \smallsetminus \Omega_i^{-1}(\bar{\mathcal{B}}_0^{r_2})$ and $S_2 \smallsetminus \Xi_0^{-1}(\bar{\mathcal{B}}_0^{1/r_1})$ of S_1 and S_2, respectively, are super-Riemann submanifolds of S_1 and S_2, respectively. Let

$$\big(S_1 \smallsetminus \Omega_i^{-1}(\bar{\mathcal{B}}_0^{r_2})\big) \sqcup \big(S_2 \smallsetminus \Xi_0^{-1}(\bar{\mathcal{B}}_0^{1/r_1})\big)$$

be the disjoint union of $S_1 \smallsetminus \Omega_i^{-1}(\bar{\mathcal{B}}_0^{r_2})$ and $S_2 \smallsetminus \Xi_0^{-1}(\bar{\mathcal{B}}_0^{1/r_1})$. On this disjoint union we define the equivalence relation $\sim$ by setting $p \sim q$ for $p, q \in (S_1 \smallsetminus \Omega_i^{-1}(\bar{\mathcal{B}}_0^{r_2})) \sqcup (S_2 \smallsetminus \Xi_0^{-1}(\bar{\mathcal{B}}_0^{1/r_1}))$ if and only if $p = q$ or $p \in \Omega_i^{-1}(\mathcal{B}_0^{r_1} \smallsetminus \bar{\mathcal{B}}_0^{r_2})$, $q \in \Xi_0^{-1}(\mathcal{B}_0^{1/r_2} \smallsetminus \bar{\mathcal{B}}_0^{1/r_1})$, and

$$\Xi_0^{-1} \circ I \circ \Omega_i(p) = q \tag{2.22}$$

for $I(z, \theta) = (1/z, i\theta/z)$. Define the super-Riemann surface $S_1 \; {}_i\infty_0 \; S_2$ to be the topological superspace

$$\Big(\big(S_1 \smallsetminus \Omega_i^{-1}(\bar{\mathcal{B}}_0^{r_2})\big) \sqcup \big(S_2 \smallsetminus \Xi_0^{-1}(\bar{\mathcal{B}}_0^{1/r_1})\big)\Big) / \sim$$

with the superconformal structure determined by the superconformal structures on $S_1 \smallsetminus \Omega_i^{-1}(\bar{\mathcal{B}}_0^{r_2})$ and $S_2 \smallsetminus \Xi_0^{-1}(\bar{\mathcal{B}}_0^{1/r_1})$ and the superconformal transition map

$$\Xi_0^{-1} \circ I \circ \Omega_i : \Omega_i^{-1}(\mathcal{B}_0^{r_1} \smallsetminus \bar{\mathcal{B}}_0^{r_2}) \longrightarrow \Xi_0^{-1}(\mathcal{B}_0^{1/r_2} \smallsetminus \bar{\mathcal{B}}_0^{1/r_1}).$$

In other words, $S_1 \; {}_i\infty_0 \; S_2$ is the union of $S_1 \smallsetminus \Omega_i^{-1}(\bar{\mathcal{B}}_0^{r_2})$ and $S_2 \smallsetminus \Xi_0^{-1}(\bar{\mathcal{B}}_0^{1/r_1})$ with the super-annulus $\Omega_i^{-1}(\mathcal{B}_0^{r_1} \smallsetminus \bar{\mathcal{B}}_0^{r_2}) \subset S_1 \smallsetminus \Omega_i^{-1}(\bar{\mathcal{B}}_0^{r_2})$ identified with the super-annulus $\Xi_0^{-1}(\mathcal{B}_0^{1/r_2} \smallsetminus \bar{\mathcal{B}}_0^{1/r_1}) \subset S_2 \smallsetminus \Xi_0^{-1}(\bar{\mathcal{B}}_0^{1/r_1})$ via the super-inversion map $I(z, \theta) = (1/z, i\theta/z)$. Note that $S_1 \smallsetminus \Omega_i^{-1}(\bar{\mathcal{B}}_0^{r_2})$ and $S_2 \smallsetminus \Xi_0^{-1}(\bar{\mathcal{B}}_0^{1/r_1})$ are super-Riemann submanifolds of $S_1 \; {}_i\infty_0 \; S_2$ and that $S_1 \; {}_i\infty_0 \; S_2$ is a supersphere with $1+(m+n-1)$ tubes.

(ii) The $1+(m+n-1)$ ordered punctures of $S_1\ {}_i\infty_0\ S_2$ are

$$p_0, p_1, ..., p_{i-1}, q_1, ..., q_n, p_{i+1}, ..., p_m$$

where p_0 is negatively oriented and the rest of the punctures are positively oriented.

(iii) The local coordinates vanishing at these punctures are

$$\left(U_k \smallsetminus \Omega_i^{-1}(\bar{\mathcal{B}}_0^r), \Omega_k|_{U_k \smallsetminus \Omega_i^{-1}(\bar{\mathcal{B}}_0^r)}\right), \quad k \neq i,$$

$$\left(V_l \smallsetminus \Xi_0^{-1}(\bar{\mathcal{B}}_0^{1/r}), \Xi_l|_{V_l \smallsetminus \Xi_0^{-1}(\bar{\mathcal{B}}_0^{1/r})}\right), \quad l \neq 0.$$

The above procedure to obtain a supersphere with $1+(m+n-1)$ tubes from a supersphere S_1 with $1+m$ tubes and a supersphere S_2 with $1+n$ tubes is called the *sewing operation* for superspheres with tubes.

REMARK 2.12. As in the non-super case of spheres with tubes, only the local coordinate neighborhoods on the sewn supersphere $S_1\ {}_i\infty_0\ S_2$ might depend on the positive number r. Thus from the definition of superconformal equivalence, we see that the superconformal equivalence class of this supersphere with $1+(m+n-1)$ tubes is independent of r. It is also easy to see that this superconformal equivalence class only depends on the superconformal equivalence classes of

$$(S_1; p_0, ..., p_m; (U_0, \Omega_0), ..., (U_m, \Omega_m))$$

and

$$(S_2; q_0, ..., q_n; (V_0, \Xi_0), ..., (V_n, \Xi_n)).$$

2.5. The moduli space of superspheres with tubes

The collection of all superconformal equivalence classes of superspheres over $\bigwedge_{*>0}$ with $1+n$ tubes, for $n \in \mathbb{N}$, is called the *moduli space of superspheres over* $\bigwedge_{*>0}$ *with* $1+n$ *tubes.* The collection of all superconformal equivalence classes of superspheres over $\bigwedge_{*>0}$ with tubes is called the *moduli space of superspheres over* $\bigwedge_{*>0}$ *with tubes.*

Let $S\hat{\mathbb{C}}$ be the supersphere with superconformal structure given by the covering of local coordinate neighborhoods $\{U_\Delta, U_\Upsilon\}$ and the local coordinate maps

$$\begin{array}{rcl} \Delta : U_\Delta & \longrightarrow & \bigwedge_{*>0} \\ \Upsilon : U_\Upsilon & \longrightarrow & \bigwedge_{*>0} \end{array}$$

which are homeomorphisms of U_Δ onto $\bigwedge_{*>0}$ and U_Υ onto $\bigwedge_{*>0}$, respectively, such that

$$\begin{array}{rcl} \Delta \circ \Upsilon^{-1} : \bigwedge_{*>0}^\times & \longrightarrow & \bigwedge_{*>0}^\times \\ (w, \rho) & \mapsto & \left(\dfrac{1}{w}, \dfrac{i\rho}{w}\right) = I(w, \rho). \end{array}$$

Thus the body of $S\hat{\mathbb{C}}$ is the Riemann sphere, $(S\hat{\mathbb{C}})_B = \hat{\mathbb{C}} = \mathbb{C} \cup \{\infty\}$, with coordinates w_B near 0 and $1/w_B$ near ∞. We will call $S\hat{\mathbb{C}}$ the *super-Riemann sphere* and will refer to $\Upsilon^{-1}(0)$ as *the point at* $(\infty, 0)$ or just *the point at infinity* and to $\Delta^{-1}(0)$ as *the point at* $(0,0)$ or just *the point at zero.*

The Lie supergroup of superconformal isomorphisms of $S\hat{\mathbb{C}}$ is isomorphic to the connected component of $OSP(1|2)$ containing the identity (see [**D**], [**CR**]). This is the group of superprojective transformations and is given by

$$\left\{\left(\frac{aw+b}{cw+d}+\rho\frac{\gamma w+\delta}{(cw+d)^2},\frac{\gamma w+\delta}{cw+d}+\rho\frac{1+\frac{1}{2}\delta\gamma}{cw+d}\right)\;\middle|\;\begin{array}{c} a,b,c,d\in\bigwedge_{*-1}^{0},\\ \gamma,\delta\in\bigwedge_{*-1}^{1},\ ad-bc=1\end{array}\right\}.$$

For such a superprojective transformation T, define

$$\begin{aligned}T_\Delta : \bigwedge\nolimits_{*>0} \smallsetminus \big(\{(-d/c)_B\}\times(\bigwedge\nolimits_{*>0})_S\big) &\longrightarrow \bigwedge\nolimits_{*>0} \smallsetminus \big(\{(a/c)_B\}\times(\bigwedge\nolimits_{*>0})_S\big)\\ (w,\rho) &\mapsto \left(\frac{aw+b}{cw+d}+\rho\frac{\gamma w+\delta}{(cw+d)^2},\frac{\gamma w+\delta}{cw+d}+\rho\frac{1+\frac{1}{2}\delta\gamma}{cw+d}\right),\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}T_\Upsilon : \bigwedge\nolimits_{*>0} \smallsetminus \big(\{(-a/b)_B\}\times(\bigwedge\nolimits_{*>0})_S\big) &\longrightarrow \bigwedge\nolimits_{*>0} \smallsetminus \big(\{(d/b)_B\}\times\big(\bigwedge\nolimits_{*>0})_S\big)\\ (w,\rho) &\mapsto \left(\frac{c+dw}{a+bw}-i\rho\frac{\gamma+\delta w}{(a+bw)^2},-i\frac{\gamma+\delta w}{a+bw}+\rho\frac{1+\frac{1}{2}\delta\gamma}{a+bw}\right),\end{aligned}$$

i.e., $T_\Upsilon(w,\rho)=I^{-1}\circ T_\Delta\circ I(w,\rho)$ for $(w,\rho)\in\bigwedge^{\times}_{*>0}\smallsetminus(\{(-a/b)_B\}\times(\bigwedge_{*>0})_S)$.

Define

$$T(p)=\left\{\begin{array}{ll}\Delta^{-1}\circ T_\Delta\circ\Delta(p) & \text{if } p\in U_\Delta\smallsetminus\Delta^{-1}(\{(-d/c)_B\}\times(\bigwedge_{*>0})_S),\\ \Upsilon^{-1}\circ T_\Upsilon\circ\Upsilon(p) & \text{if } p\in U_\Upsilon\smallsetminus\Upsilon^{-1}(\{(-a/b)_B\}\times(\bigwedge_{*>0})_S)\ .\end{array}\right. \tag{2.23}$$

This defines T for all $p\in S\hat{\mathbb{C}}$ unless

(i) $a_B=0$ and $p\in\Upsilon^{-1}(\{0\}\times(\bigwedge_{*>0})_S)$. In which case we define

$$T(p)=\Delta^{-1}\left(\frac{a+bw}{c+dw}+i\rho\frac{\gamma+\delta w}{(c+dw)^2},\frac{\gamma+\delta w}{c+dw}+i\rho\frac{1+\frac{1}{2}\delta\gamma)}{c+dw}\right), \tag{2.24}$$

for $\Upsilon(p)=(w,\rho)=(w_S,\rho)$; or

(ii) $d_B=0$ and $p\in\Delta^{-1}(\{0\}\times(\bigwedge_{*>0})_S)$. In which case we define

$$T(p)=\Upsilon^{-1}\left(\frac{cw+d}{aw+b}-\rho\frac{\gamma w+\delta}{(aw+b)^2},-i\frac{\gamma w+\delta}{aw+b}-i\rho\frac{1+\frac{1}{2}\delta\gamma}{aw+b}\right) \tag{2.25}$$

for $\Delta(p)=(w,\rho)=(w_S,\rho)$.

Note that with this definition, T is uniquely determined by T_Δ, i.e., by its value on $\Delta(U_\Delta)$.

In [**CR**], Crane and Rabin prove the uniformization theorem for super-Riemann surfaces. We state the result for super-Riemann surfaces with genus-zero compact bodies.

THEOREM 2.13. *([**CR**] Uniformization) Any super-Riemann surface with genus-zero compact body is superconformally equivalent to the super-Riemann sphere $S\hat{\mathbb{C}}$.*

Note that in our definition of the super-Riemann sphere $S\hat{\mathbb{C}}$, we have chosen the transition function $\Delta\circ\Upsilon^{-1}=I(z,\theta)=(1/z,i\theta/z)$, but we could just as well have chosen this transition to be $I(z,-\theta)=(1/z,-i\theta/z)$. We will denote the latter super-Riemann surface with genus-zero body by $(S\hat{\mathbb{C}})^-$ with coordinate charts $\{(U_\Delta^-,\Delta^-),(U_\Upsilon^-,\Upsilon^-)\}$ such that $\Delta^-\circ(\Upsilon^-)^{-1}(z,\theta)=I(z,-\theta)$. These two superspheres are of course superconformally equivalent via $F:S\hat{\mathbb{C}}\to(S\hat{\mathbb{C}})^-$ defined by

$$F(p)=\left\{\begin{array}{ll}(\Delta^-)^{-1}\circ J\circ\Delta(p) & \text{for } p\in U_\Delta\\ (\Upsilon^-)^{-1}\circ\Upsilon(p) & \text{for } p\in U_\Upsilon\end{array}\right.$$

where $J : \bigwedge_{*>0} \to \bigwedge_{*>0}$ is given by $J(z, \theta) = (z, -\theta)$. In [**B1**] and [**B2**], we discuss the "moduli space of superspheres with tubes with positive versus negative square root structure". In this paper, we do not deal with the change of variables related to this symmetry, but rather leave that discussion for another paper.

REMARK 2.14. In Chapter 4, we will want to consider functions on the moduli space of superspheres with tubes which are superanalytic or supermeromorphic. These superfunctions will in general involve an infinite number of odd variables — not only the odd part of the coordinate for the finite number of punctures but also the possibly infinite amount of odd data involved in describing the local coordinates about the punctures. (See Remarks 2.16 and 2.17 below.) In this case, we need to work over $\bigwedge_\infty$ if we want all multiple partial derivatives with respect to these odd variables to be well defined. However, in this work, it turns out that we only take up to two partial derivatives at a time with respect to odd variables before evaluating. Thus we could work over a finite Grassmann algebra that allows us two extra degrees of freedom at any given time (or a few extra degrees of freedom just in case the need were to arise to take a few more partial derivatives in a row before evaluating). On the other hand, it is no harder to work over an infinite Grassmann algebra; the results we are interested in still hold, and then we may take partial derivatives without concern. One may always later restrict to some $\bigwedge_L$ for $L \in \mathbb{N}$ when substituting for these variables in the functional part of the theory or restrict to the supermanifold substructure defined in Section 2.3 for geometric aspects of the theory. Thus for the remainder of this paper, we will mainly work over an infinite Grassmann algebra.

Let

$$\mathcal{B}^r_\infty = \Big\{(w, \rho) \in \bigwedge\nolimits_\infty \;\Big|\; \Big|\frac{1}{w_B}\Big| < r\Big\}.$$

PROPOSITION 2.15. *Any supersphere over $\bigwedge_\infty$ with $1 + n$ tubes for $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ is superconformally equivalent to a supersphere with $1 + n$ tubes of the form*

$$\begin{aligned}(2.26)\quad \Big(S\hat{\mathbb{C}}; \Upsilon^{-1}(0), \Delta^{-1}(z_1, \theta_1), \ldots.., \Delta^{-1}(z_{n-1}, \theta_{n-1}), \Delta^{-1}(0);\\ \big(\Upsilon^{-1}(\mathcal{B}_0^{1/r_0}), \Xi_0\big), \big(\Delta^{-1}(\mathcal{B}_{z_1}^{r_1}), H_1 \circ \Delta\big), \ldots,\\ \big(\Delta^{-1}(\mathcal{B}_{z_{n-1}}^{r_{n-1}}), H_{n-1} \circ \Delta\big), \big(\Delta^{-1}(\mathcal{B}_0^{r_n}), H_n \circ \Delta\big)\Big),\end{aligned}$$

where

$$(2.27)\qquad \Xi_0|_{\Delta^{-1}(\mathcal{B}^{r_0}_\infty)} = H_0 \circ \Delta,$$

$$\begin{aligned}(2.28)\qquad (z_1, \theta_1), \ldots., (z_{n-1}, \theta_{n-1}) \in \bigwedge\nolimits_\infty^\times, \quad \textit{and} \quad (z_i)_B \neq (z_j)_B \quad \textit{for} \quad i \neq j,\\ r_0, \ldots, r_n \in \mathbb{R}_+ = \{r \in \mathbb{R} \mid r > 0\},\end{aligned}$$

and $H_0, H_1, \ldots, H_{n-1}, H_n$ are superconformal functions on $\mathcal{B}^{r_0}_\infty$, $\mathcal{B}^{r_1}_{z_1}$,..., $\mathcal{B}^{r_{n-1}}_{z_{n-1}}$, $\mathcal{B}^{r_n}_0$, respectively, such that if we let $H_0(w, \rho) = (\tilde{w}_0, \tilde{\rho}_0)$, then

$$(2.29)\qquad \lim_{w\to\infty} H_0(w, \rho) = 0, \quad \textit{and} \quad \lim_{w\to\infty} \frac{\partial}{\partial\rho}\frac{\partial}{\partial(\frac{1}{w})}\tilde{\rho}_0(w, \rho) = \lim_{w\to\infty} \frac{\partial}{\partial\rho} w\tilde{\rho}_0 = i;$$

$$(2.30)\qquad H_j(z_j, \theta_j) = 0, \quad \textit{and} \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial w} H_j(w, \theta_j)\Big|_{w=z_j} = \lim_{w\to z_j} \frac{H_j(w, \theta_j)}{w - z_j} \in \bigwedge\nolimits_\infty^\times,$$

for $j = 1, ..., n-1$*; and*

$$H_n(0) = 0, \quad \textit{and} \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial w} H_n(w,0)\Big|_{w=0} = \lim_{w \to 0} \frac{H_n(w,0)}{w} \in {\textstyle\bigwedge}_\infty^\times. \tag{2.31}$$

Proof. By the uniformization theorem for super-Riemann surfaces, Theorem 2.13, any supersphere is superconformally isomorphic to the supersphere $S\hat{\mathbb{C}}$. Let

$$(S; p_0, ..., p_n; (U_0, \Omega_0), ..., (U_n, \Omega_n)) \tag{2.32}$$

be a supersphere with $1+n$ tubes and $F : S \to S\hat{\mathbb{C}}$ a superconformal isomorphism. We have a supersphere with $1+n$ tubes

$$(S\hat{\mathbb{C}}; F(p_0), ..., F(p_n); (F(U_0), \Omega_0 \circ F^{-1}), ..., (F(U_n), \Omega_n \circ F^{-1})) \tag{2.33}$$

which is superconformally equivalent to (2.32). Let

$$\Omega_0 \circ F^{-1} \circ \Delta^{-1}(w, \rho) = ((\Omega_0 \circ F^{-1} \circ \Delta^{-1})^0(w,\rho), (\Omega_0 \circ F^{-1} \circ \Delta^{-1})^1(w,\rho)).$$

We have three cases:

(i) If $F(p_0), F(p_n) \in U_\Delta$, let

$$\Delta(F(p_0)) = (u_0, v_0) \in {\textstyle\bigwedge}_\infty^0 \oplus {\textstyle\bigwedge}_\infty^1$$
$$\Delta(F(p_n)) = (u_n, v_n) \in {\textstyle\bigwedge}_\infty^0 \oplus {\textstyle\bigwedge}_\infty^1.$$

Then

$$\lim_{v_0 \to 0} \frac{\partial}{\partial \rho} \Omega_0 \circ F^{-1} \circ \Delta^{-1}(u_0, \rho) = a$$

uniquely determines $a \in ({\textstyle\bigwedge}_\infty^0)^\times$. In this case, let $T : S\hat{\mathbb{C}} \to S\hat{\mathbb{C}}$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta \circ T \circ \Delta^{-1}(w,\rho) \; &= \; T_\Delta(w,\rho) \\ &= \left(\frac{-1}{a^2(u_n - u_0 - v_n v_0)} \cdot \frac{w - u_n}{w - u_0} \; - \; \rho \, \frac{(v_0 - v_n)w + v_n u_0 - u_n v_0}{a^2(u_n - u_0)(w - u_0)^2}, \right. \\ &\qquad \left. - \; i \, \frac{(v_0 - v_n)w + v_n u_0 - u_n v_0}{a(u_n - u_0)(w - u_0)} \; - \; \frac{i\rho}{a(w - u_0)} \right). \end{aligned}$$

(ii) If $F(p_n) \notin U_\Delta$, i.e., $\Upsilon(F(p_n)) = (u_n', v_n') \in {\textstyle\bigwedge}_\infty$ with $(u_n')_B = 0$, let $\Delta(F(p_0)) = (u_0, v_0) \in {\textstyle\bigwedge}_\infty$. Then

$$\lim_{v_0 \to 0} \frac{\partial}{\partial \rho} \Omega_0 \circ F^{-1} \circ \Delta^{-1}(u_0, \rho) = a$$

uniquely determines $a \in ({\textstyle\bigwedge}_\infty^0)^\times$. In this case, let

$$\begin{aligned} &T_\Delta(w,\rho) \\ &= \left(\frac{-1}{a^2(1 - u_n' u_0 - i v_n' v_0)} \cdot \frac{u_n' w - 1}{w - u_0} \; - \; \rho \, \frac{(u_n' v_0 - i v_n')w + i v_n' u_0 - v_0}{a^2(1 - u_n' u_0)(w - u_0)^2}, \right. \\ &\qquad \left. - \; i \, \frac{(u_n' v_0 - i v_n')w + i v_n' u_0 - v_0}{a(1 - u_n' u_0)(w - u_0)} \; - \; \frac{i\rho}{a(w - u_0)} \right). \end{aligned}$$

(iii) If $F(p_0) \notin U_\Delta$, i.e., $\Upsilon(F(p_0)) = (u_0', v_0') \in {\textstyle\bigwedge}_\infty$ with $(u_0')_B = 0$, let $\Delta(F(p_n)) = (u_n, v_n) \in {\textstyle\bigwedge}_\infty$. Then

$$\lim_{v_0' \to 0} \frac{\partial}{\partial \rho} \Omega_0 \circ F^{-1} \circ \Upsilon^{-1}(u_0', \rho) = a'$$

uniquely determines $a' \in (\bigwedge_\infty^0)^\times$. In this case, let

$$\begin{aligned} &T_\Delta(w,\rho) \\ &= \Bigg(\frac{1}{(a')^2(1-u_nu_0'+iv_nv_0')}\cdot\frac{-w+u_n}{u_0'w-1} \;+\; \rho\,\frac{(-iv_0'+u_0'v_n)w-v_n+iu_nv_0'}{(a')^2(1-u_nu_0')(u_0'w-1)^2}, \\ &\qquad\qquad \frac{(-iv_0'+u_0'v_n)w-v_n+iu_nv_0'}{a'(1-u_nu_0')(u_0'w-1)} \;+\; \frac{\rho}{a'(u_0'w-1)}\Bigg). \end{aligned}$$

Then in each case (i) - (iii), T_Δ uniquely defines $T : S\hat{\mathbb{C}} \to S\hat{\mathbb{C}}$ by (2.23) - (2.25), and the supersphere with tubes (2.33) is superconformally equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned} (2.34)\quad &(S\hat{\mathbb{C}}; \Upsilon^{-1}(0), \Delta^{-1}(z_1,\theta_1), \ldots.., \Delta^{-1}(z_{n-1},\theta_{n-1}), \Delta^{-1}(0); \\ &\qquad (T\circ F(U_0), \Omega_0\circ F^{-1}\circ T^{-1}), \ldots, (T\circ F(U_n), \Omega_n\circ F^{-1}\circ T^{-1})) \end{aligned}$$

where

$$(z_j,\theta_j) = \Delta\circ T\circ F(p_j),$$

for $j = 1, \ldots, n-1$. Choose $r_0, \ldots, r_n \in \mathbb{R}_+$ such that

$$\mathcal{B}_\infty^{r_0} \subset \Delta\circ T\circ F(U_0)$$

$$\mathcal{B}_{z_j}^{r_j} \subset \Delta\circ T\circ F(U_j), \quad j = 1, \ldots, n-1,$$

$$\mathcal{B}_0^{r_n} \subset \Delta\circ T\circ F(U_n).$$

Then the supersphere with tubes (2.34) is superconformally equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned} \Big(&S\hat{\mathbb{C}}; \Upsilon^{-1}(0), \Delta^{-1}(z_1,\theta_1), \ldots.., \Delta^{-1}(z_{n-1},\theta_{n-1}), \Delta^{-1}(0); \\ &\quad \big(\Delta^{-1}(\mathcal{B}_\infty^{r_0}) \cup \Upsilon^{-1}(\{0\}\times(\textstyle\bigwedge_\infty)_S), \Omega_0\circ F^{-1}\circ T^{-1}\big), \\ &\quad \big(\Delta^{-1}(\mathcal{B}_{z_1}^{r_1}), \Omega_1\circ F^{-1}\circ T^{-1}\big), \ldots, \big(\Delta^{-1}(\mathcal{B}_{z_{n-1}}^{r_{n-1}}), \Omega_{n-2}\circ F^{-1}\circ T^{-1}\big), \\ &\qquad\qquad \big(\Delta^{-1}(\mathcal{B}_0^{r_n}), \Omega_n\circ F^{-1}\circ T^{-1}\big)\Big) \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} H_0 &= \Omega_0\circ F^{-1}\circ T^{-1}\circ\Delta^{-1}\big|_{\mathcal{B}_\infty^{r_0}}, \\ H_j &= \Omega_j\circ F^{-1}\circ T^{-1}\circ\Delta^{-1}\big|_{\mathcal{B}_{z_j}^{r_j}}, \quad j = 1, \ldots, n-1, \\ H_n &= \Omega_n\circ F^{-1}\circ T^{-1}\circ\Delta^{-1}\big|_{\mathcal{B}_0^{r_n}} \end{aligned}$$

satisfy (2.29), (2.30), and (2.31), respectively. □

A supersphere with $1+n$ tubes, for $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, of the form (2.26) is called a *canonical supersphere with* $1+n$ *tubes.*

REMARK 2.16. A canonical supersphere with $1+n$ tubes, for $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, is determined by the punctures $(z_1,\theta_1), \ldots, (z_{n-1},\theta_{n-1}) \in \bigwedge_\infty^\times$ with $(z_i)_B \neq (z_j)_B$ if $i \neq j$, the radii $r_0, \ldots, r_n \in \mathbb{R}_+$ and the superconformal functions $H_0, \ldots, H_n$ satisfying (2.29), (2.30), and (2.31), respectively. Consider the superconformal power series obtained by expanding the superconformal functions $H_0, \ldots, H_n$ around $\Upsilon^{-1}(0) = \infty$, $(z_1,\theta_1), \ldots, (z_{n-1},\theta_{n-1})$, and 0, respectively. We will denote by H_i both the superconformal function and its power series expansion. By (2.16) and

(2.17), the conditions (2.29), (2.30), and (2.31) and the fact that the H_j's are one-to-one as superanalytic functions on their domains, we have

$$H_0(w,\rho) = \Bigg(\frac{1}{w} + \sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+} a_j^{(0)} w^{-j-1} + \frac{i\rho}{w}\Big(\sum_{j\in\mathbb{N}} m_j^{(0)} w^{-j-1}\Big)\times \Big(1+\sum_{j\in\mathbb{N}} c_j^{(0)} w^{-j-1}\Big),\ \sum_{j\in\mathbb{N}} m_j^{(0)} w^{-j-1} + \frac{i\rho}{w}\Big(1+\sum_{j\in\mathbb{N}} c_j^{(0)} w^{-j-1}\Big)\Bigg), \tag{2.35}$$

$$H_i(w,\rho) = \Bigg((a_\square^{(i)})^2\Big(w + \sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+} a_j^{(i)} w^{j+1} + \rho\Big(\sum_{j\in\mathbb{N}} m_j^{(i)} w^{j+1}\Big)\times \Big(1+\sum_{j\in\mathbb{N}} c_j^{(i)} w^{j+1}\Big)\Big),\ a_\square^{(i)}\Big(\sum_{j\in\mathbb{N}} m_j^{(i)} w^{j+1} + \rho\Big(1+\sum_{j\in\mathbb{N}} c_j^{(i)} w^{j+1}\Big)\Big)\Bigg)\Bigg|_{\substack{(w,\rho)=(w-z_i\\ -\rho\theta_i,\,\rho-\theta_i)}} \tag{2.36}$$

for $i=1,...,n$, where $(z_n,\theta_n)=0$, $a_\square^{(i)} \in (\bigwedge_\infty^0)^\times$, $a_j^{(i)} \in \bigwedge_\infty^0$, for $j\in\mathbb{Z}_+$, $m_j^{(i)} \in \bigwedge_\infty^1$, for $j\in\mathbb{N}$, and where $\Big(1+\sum_{j\in\mathbb{N}} c_j^{(0)} w^{-j-1}\Big)$ is the power series expansion about infinity of

$$\Big(1+\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}(j+1)a_j^{(0)}w^{-j} + \sum_{j,k\in\mathbb{N}}(k+1)m_j^{(0)}m_k^{(0)}w^{-j-k-1}\Big)^{1/2},$$

and $\Big(1+\sum_{j\in\mathbb{N}} c_j^{(i)} w^{j+1}\Big)$ is the power series expansion about zero of

$$\Big(1+\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}(j+1)a_j^{(i)}w^{j} + \sum_{j,k\in\mathbb{N}}(k+1)m_j^{(i)}m_k^{(i)}w^{j+k+1}\Big)^{1/2}.$$

Thus a canonical supersphere with $1+n$ tubes, for $n\in\mathbb{Z}_+$, can be denoted by

$$((z_1,\theta_1),...,(z_{n-1},\theta_{n-1}); r_0,...,r_n; H_0,...,H_n) \tag{2.37}$$

where $H_0,...,H_n$ are power series of the form (2.35) and (2.36).

REMARK 2.17. From the Remark 2.16 above, we can readily see that a point in the moduli space of superspheres with $1+n$ tubes, for $n\in\mathbb{Z}_+$, will in general depend on an infinite number of odd variables — the $\theta_1,...,\theta_{n-1}$ and the $m_j^{(i)} \in \bigwedge_\infty^1$, for $i=0,...,n$, and $j\in\mathbb{N}$.

REMARK 2.18. In (2.36), we have factored out $(a_\square^{(i)})^2$ from the even part of H_i and $a_\square^{(i)}$ from the odd part (cf. equation (2.16)). This is due to the unique role that the $a_\square^{(i)}$'s play, not only in determining which square root is involved in the superconformal structure of H_i (see Remark 2.9), but also in determining the scaling of the local coordinate. Factoring out this scaling operator is necessary if one wants to achieve a certain symmetry in expressing the infinitesimal local coordinate transformations at the punctures (see Remark 3.24).

PROPOSITION 2.19. *Two canonical superspheres with $1+n$ tubes, for $n\in\mathbb{Z}_+$,*

$$((z_1,\theta_1),...,(z_{n-1},\theta_{n-1}); r_0,...,r_n; H_0,...,H_n) \tag{2.38}$$

and

$$((\hat{z}_1, \hat{\theta}_1), ..., (\hat{z}_{n-1}, \hat{\theta}_{n-1}); \hat{r}_0, ..., \hat{r}_n; \hat{H}_0, ..., \hat{H}_n) \tag{2.39}$$

are superconformally equivalent if and only if $(z_j, \theta_j) = (\hat{z}_j, \hat{\theta}_j)$ *for* $j = 1, ..., n-1$, *and* $H_j = \hat{H}_j$, *for* $j = 0, ..., n$, *as superconformal power series.*

Proof. Let F be a superconformal equivalence from (2.38) to (2.39). The conclusion of the proposition is equivalent to the assertion that F must be the identity map on $S\hat{\mathbb{C}}$. By definition F is a superconformal automorphism of $S\hat{\mathbb{C}}$, i.e., a superprojective transformation. Also by definition we have

$$F_\Delta(0) = \Delta \circ F \circ \Delta^{-1}(0) = 0, \tag{2.40}$$

$$F_\Upsilon(0) = \Upsilon \circ F \circ \Upsilon^{-1}(0) = 0, \tag{2.41}$$

$$\hat{H}_0|_{\mathcal{B}_\infty^{\min(r_0, \hat{r}_0)}} = H_0 \circ F_\Delta^{-1}|_{\mathcal{B}_\infty^{\min(r_0, \hat{r}_0)}}. \tag{2.42}$$

From (2.40) and (2.41) and the fact that F is a superprojective transformation, we obtain

$$F_\Delta(w, \rho) = (a^2 w, a\rho) \tag{2.43}$$

for some $a \in (\bigwedge_\infty^0)^\times$. Let $H_0(w, \rho) = (\tilde{w}_0, \tilde{\rho}_0)$ and $\hat{H}_0(w, \rho) = (\hat{w}_0, \hat{\rho}_0)$. From (2.29), we know that

$$\lim_{w \to \infty} \frac{\partial}{\partial \rho} w \tilde{\rho}_0(w, \rho) = \lim_{w \to \infty} \frac{\partial}{\partial \rho} w \hat{\rho}_0(w, \rho) = i.$$

Thus by (2.42) and (2.43)

$$\begin{aligned} i &= \lim_{w \to \infty} \frac{\partial}{\partial \rho} w \hat{\rho}_0(w, \rho) = \lim_{w \to \infty} \frac{\partial}{\partial \rho} w (H_0 \circ F_\Delta^{-1})^1(w, \rho) \\ &= \lim_{w \to \infty} \frac{\partial}{\partial \rho} w \tilde{\rho}_0\Big(\frac{w}{a^2}, \frac{\rho}{a}\Big) \\ &= \frac{i}{a}, \end{aligned}$$

i.e., $a = 1$. Thus F must be the identity map of $S\hat{\mathbb{C}}$. □

For superspheres with one tube, we have:

Proposition 2.20. *Any supersphere with one tube is superconformally equivalent to a supersphere with one tube of the form*

$$\big(S\hat{\mathbb{C}}; \Upsilon^{-1}(0); (\Upsilon^{-1}(\mathcal{B}_0^{1/r_0}), \Xi_0)\big) \tag{2.44}$$

where $\Xi_0|_{(\Delta^{-1}(\mathcal{B}_\infty^{r_0})} = H_0 \circ \Delta$, *and* H_0 *can be expanded in a power series about infinity of the form (2.35) with* $a_1^{(0)} = m_0^{(0)} = 0$, *i.e., such that the even coefficient of* w^{-2} *and the odd coefficient of* w^{-1} *in* H_0 *are zero.*

Proof. Given a supersphere with one tube

$$(S; p; (U, \Omega)), \tag{2.45}$$

by the uniformization theorem for super-Riemann surfaces, Theorem 2.13, there exists a superconformal isomorphism $F : S \to S\hat{\mathbb{C}}$ such that

$$(S\hat{\mathbb{C}}; F(p); (F(U), \Omega \circ F^{-1})) \tag{2.46}$$

is superconformally equivalent to (2.45). By cases (i) and (ii) in the proof of Proposition 2.15, we know there exists a (non-unique) superprojective transformation T from (2.46) to $(S\hat{\mathbb{C}}; T \circ F(p); (T \circ F(U), \Omega \circ F^{-1} \circ T^{-1}))$ such that $\Upsilon \circ T \circ F(p) = 0$, and there exists $r \in \mathbb{R}_+$ satisfying $\Delta^{-1}(\mathcal{B}^r_\infty) \subseteq T \circ F(U)$, and $\Omega \circ F^{-1} \circ T^{-1} \circ \Delta^{-1}\big|_{\mathcal{B}^r_\infty} = H$ where $H(w, \rho)$ satisfies (2.29), i.e., has a power series expansion of the form (2.35).

Let $\hat{T}_\Delta(w, \rho) = (w - a_1 - i\rho m_0, -im_0 + \rho)$ where a_1 is the even coefficient of w^{-2} and m_0 is the odd coefficient of w^{-1} in the power series expansion of H about infinity. Then $H_0 = \Omega \circ F^{-1} \circ T^{-1} \circ \hat{T}^{-1} \circ \Delta^{-1}$ has a power series expansion of the form (2.35) with the even coefficient of w^{-2} and the odd coefficient of w^{-1} equal to zero, and there exists some $r_0 \in \mathbb{R}_+$ such that H_0 is convergent in $\mathcal{B}^{r_0}_\infty$. □

A supersphere with one tube of the form (2.44) is called a *canonical supersphere with one tube*. A canonical supersphere with one tube is determined by $r_0 \in \mathbb{R}_+$ and a superconformal power series H_0 satisfying (2.35) with $a_1^{(0)} = m_0^{(0)} = 0$, and can be denoted by $(r_0; H_0)$. The following proposition can be proved similarly to Proposition 2.19:

PROPOSITION 2.21. *Two canonical superspheres with one tube* $(r_0; H_0)$ *and* $(\hat{r_0}; \hat{H}_0)$ *are superconformally equivalent if and only if* $H_0 = \hat{H}_0$.

From Propositions 2.15, 2.19, 2.20, and 2.21 we have the following corollary.

COROLLARY 2.22. *There is a bijection between the set of canonical superspheres with tubes and the moduli space of superspheres with tubes. In particular, the moduli space of superspheres with* $1 + n$ *tubes, for* $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, *can be identified with all* $2n$*-tuples* $((z_1, \theta_1), ..., (z_{n-1}, \theta_{n-1}); H_0, ..., H_n)$ *satisfying* $(z_i, \theta_i) \in \bigwedge_\infty^\times$, *with* $(z_i)_B \neq (z_j)_B$ *if* $i \neq j$, *for* $i, j = 1, ..., n-1$, *and such that* $H_0, ..., H_n$ *are of the form (2.35) and (2.36), respectively, and are absolutely convergent in neighborhoods of* ∞, $(z_1, \theta_1), ..., (z_{n-1}, \theta_{n-1})$, *and* 0, *respectively. The moduli space of superspheres with one tube can be identified with the set of all power series* H_0 *of the form (2.35) such that* $a_1^{(0)} = m_0^{(0)} = 0$ *and such that* H_0 *is absolutely convergent in a neighborhood of* ∞. [1]

2.6. The sewing equation

Let

$$C_1 = \big((z_1, \theta_1), ..., (z_{m-1}, \theta_{m-1}); H_0, ..., H_m\big)$$

and

$$C_2 = \big((\hat{z}_1, \hat{\theta}_1), ..., (\hat{z}_{n-1}, \hat{\theta}_{n-1}); \hat{H}_0, ..., \hat{H}_n\big)$$

---

[1] There is a misprint in the nonsuper analogue of Corollary 2.22 in [**H2**]. Proposition 1.3.8 in [**H2**] should state that the local coordinate $f_0(w)$ (where here w is simply a complex variable) is absolutely convergent in a neighborhood of $w = \infty$, not $w = 0$ as stated. In addition, it should state that $f_n(w)$ is absolutely convergent in a neighborhood of $w = 0$; it is stated as being absolutely convergent in a neighborhood of $w = z_n$. Corrected, the statements correspond to $(H_0)_B(w_B, 0)$ being convergent in a neighborhood of $w_B = \infty$ and $(H_n)_B(w_B, 0)$ being convergent in a neighborhood of $w_B = 0$ in Corollary 2.22 above.

represent canonical superspheres with $1+m$ tubes and $1+n$ tubes, respectively, for $m \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Suppose that it is possible to sew the 0-th puncture of C_2 to the i-th puncture of C_1 as described in Section 2.4. Then the resulting sewn supersphere $C_1 \; {}_i\infty_0 \; C_2$ is superconformally equivalent to some canonical supersphere [2]

$$C_3 = \big((z_1^*, \theta_1^*), ..., (z_{m+n-2}^*, \theta_{m+n-2}^*); H_0^*, ..., H_{m+n-1}^*\big).$$

Since C_1 and C_2 correspond to canonical superspheres, H_i is a convergent power series in some neighborhood U_i of (z_i, θ_i), and $\hat{H}_0$ is a convergent power series in some neighborhood V_0 of ∞. According to the definition of sewing, since C_2 can be sewn to the i-th puncture of C_1, there exists $r \in \mathbb{R}_+$ such that $\bar{\mathcal{B}}_0^r \subset H_i(U_i)$ and $\bar{\mathcal{B}}_0^{1/r} \subset \hat{H}_0(V_0)$ and such that $\Delta^{-1} \circ H_i^{-1}(\bar{\mathcal{B}}_0^r)$ contains only the puncture at (z_i, θ_i) and $\Delta^{-1} \circ \hat{H}_0^{-1}(\bar{\mathcal{B}}_0^{1/r} \smallsetminus (\{0\} \times (\bigwedge_\infty)_S))$ contains no punctures. Furthermore, there exist $r_1, r_2 \in \mathbb{R}_+$ such that $0 < r_2 < r < r_1$, and letting $U \subset C_2$ be given by

$$U = \Delta^{-1} \circ \hat{H}_0^{-1}\big(\bar{\mathcal{B}}_0^{1/r_1} \smallsetminus \big(\{0\} \times (\textstyle\bigwedge_\infty)_S\big)\big) \cup \Upsilon^{-1}\big(\{0\} \times (\textstyle\bigwedge_\infty)_S\big),$$

we have

$$C_1 \; {}_i\infty_0 \; C_2 = \Big(\big(C_1 \smallsetminus \Delta^{-1} \circ H_i^{-1}(\bar{\mathcal{B}}_0^{r_2})\big) \sqcup (C_2 \smallsetminus U)\Big)/\sim$$

where $p, q \in (C_1 \smallsetminus \Delta^{-1} \circ H_i^{-1}(\bar{\mathcal{B}}_0^{r_2})) \sqcup (C_2 \smallsetminus U)$ are equivalent if and only if $p = q$ or $p \in \Delta^{-1} \circ H_i^{-1}(\mathcal{B}_0^{r_1} \smallsetminus \bar{\mathcal{B}}_0^{r_2})$, $q \in \Delta^{-1} \circ \hat{H}_0^{-1}(\mathcal{B}_0^{1/r_2} \smallsetminus \bar{\mathcal{B}}_0^{1/r_1})$, and

$$\Delta^{-1} \circ \hat{H}_0^{-1} \circ I \circ H_i \circ \Delta(p) = q. \tag{2.47}$$

Let F be the unique superconformal equivalence taking $C_1 \; {}_i\infty_0 \; C_2$ to C_3. Then we can express F as two functions, one $F^{(1)}$ from $C_1 \smallsetminus \Delta^{-1} \circ H_i^{-1}(\bar{\mathcal{B}}_0^{r_2})$ to C_3 and the other $F^{(2)}$ from $C_2 \smallsetminus U$ to C_3 such that

$$\begin{array}{rcl} F : C_1 \; {}_i\infty_0 \; C_2 & \longrightarrow & C_3 \\ q & \mapsto & \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} F^{(1)}(q) & \text{for } q \in C_1 \smallsetminus \Delta^{-1} \circ H_i^{-1}(\bar{\mathcal{B}}_0^{r_2}) \\ F^{(2)}(q) & \text{for } q \in C_2 \smallsetminus U. \end{array} \right. \end{array} \tag{2.48}$$

From the definitions of the sewing operation and canonical supersphere with tubes, the maps $F^{(1)}$ and $F^{(2)}$ must satisfy the following:

(i) For $p \in \Delta^{-1} \circ H_i^{-1}(\mathcal{B}_0^{r_1} \smallsetminus \bar{\mathcal{B}}_0^{r_2}) \subset C_1$ and $q \in \Delta^{-1} \circ \hat{H}_0^{-1}(\mathcal{B}_0^{1/r_2} \smallsetminus \bar{\mathcal{B}}_0^{1/r_1}) \subset C_2$, if $p \sim q$ in $C_1 \; {}_i\infty_0 \; C_2$, then we must have $F(p) = F(q)$ in C_3. Thus by (2.47), we must have

$$F^{(1)}(p) = F^{(2)} \circ \Delta^{-1} \circ \hat{H}_0^{-1} \circ I \circ H_i \circ \Delta(p). \tag{2.49}$$

Equation (2.49) is called the *sewing equation*, and the function F is called the *uniformizing function*. In terms of the local coordinate chart (U_Δ, Δ) of $S\hat{\mathbb{C}}$, equation (2.49) is equivalent to

$$F_\Delta^{(1)}(w, \rho) = F_\Delta^{(2)} \circ \hat{H}_0^{-1} \circ I \circ H_i(w, \rho) \tag{2.50}$$

for $F_\Delta^{(1)} = \Delta \circ F^{(1)} \circ \Delta^{-1}$, $F_\Delta^{(2)} = \Delta \circ F^{(2)} \circ \Delta^{-1}$, and $(w, \rho) \in H_i^{-1}(\mathcal{B}_0^{r_1} \smallsetminus \bar{\mathcal{B}}_0^{r_2})$.

(ii) In order for C_3 to be canonical, the first puncture of C_3 must be at $\Upsilon^{-1}(0)$, i.e., at infinity, the last puncture must be at $\Delta^{-1}(0)$, i.e., at zero, and the coordinates at the punctures must satisfy the conditions (2.29) - (2.31). If $i = m$, that is if the second supersphere is being sewn into the last puncture of the first supersphere which is the puncture at zero, and if $n \neq 0$, then requiring that the resulting supersphere be canonical is equivalent to the conditions

---

[2] There is a misprint in [**H2**] on p.28 in the nonsuper analogue to this statement. The resulting sewn sphere $C_1 \; {}_i\infty_0 \; C_2$ should have local coordinates $g_0, ..., g_{m+n-1}$ vanishing at the $1+(m+n-1)$ punctures, not $g_1, ..., g_{m+n-1}$ as stated. Corrected, this corresponds to the bodies of the local coordinates, denoted $(H_0^*)_B, ..., (H_{m+n-1}^*)_B$ in our notation, in the super case.

$$F_{\Upsilon}^{(1)}(0) = 0 \tag{2.51}$$

$$\lim_{w\to\infty} \frac{\partial}{\partial \rho}(F_{\Delta}^{(1)})^1(w,\rho) = 1 \tag{2.52}$$

$$F_{\Delta}^{(2)}(0) = 0 \tag{2.53}$$

where $F_{\Upsilon}^{(1)} = \Upsilon \circ F^{(1)} \circ \Upsilon^{-1}$. Conditions (2.51) - (2.53) are called the *normalization conditions* for F.

If $i = m$ and $n \neq 0$, then the resulting canonical supersphere $F(C_1\ {}_i\infty_0\ C_2) = C_3$ is represented by

$$\begin{aligned} C_3 = \bigl(&F_{\Delta}^{(1)}(z_1,\theta_1),\ldots,F_{\Delta}^{(1)}(z_{m-1},\theta_{m-1}),F_{\Delta}^{(2)}(\hat{z}_1,\hat{\theta}_1),\ldots,F_{\Delta}^{(2)}(\hat{z}_{n-1},\hat{\theta}_{n-1});\\ &H_0\circ(F_{\Delta}^{(1)})^{-1},\ldots,H_{m-1}\circ(F_{\Delta}^{(1)})^{-1},\hat{H}_1\circ(F_{\Delta}^{(2)})^{-1},\ldots,\hat{H}_n\circ(F_{\Delta}^{(2)})^{-1}\bigr). \end{aligned}$$

Conditions (i) and (ii) completely determine F, and if $i = m$, and $n \neq 0$, then $F(C_1\ {}_i\infty_0\ C_2) = C_3$ is a canonical supersphere with $1 + (m + n - 1)$ tubes. If $i \neq m$ or $n = 0$, we can still use F determined by conditions (i) and (ii) to map $C_1\ {}_i\infty_0\ C_2$ to a super-Riemann sphere C_3, but this supersphere might not be canonical. If $n = 0$ and $i = m$ with $m > 1$, or if $n \neq m$, the last puncture of the supersphere will not be at zero since F sends the zero of the second supersphere to zero. And if $n = 0$ and $m = 1$ the resulting sewn supersphere will have only one puncture (the outgoing or negatively oriented puncture at $\Upsilon^{-1}(0) = \infty$), and the coordinate at ∞ might not satisfy the extra condition given in Proposition 2.20 which specifies that the even coefficient of w^{-2} and the odd coefficient of w^{-1} be zero for the power series expansion of the local coordinate at infinity for a canonical supersphere with only one tube. In order to account for these discrepancies one must transform C_3 to a canonical supersphere via a superprojective transformation as specified in the proofs of Propositions 2.15 and 2.20. In other words, if n and i do not satisfy the conditions that $i = m$ and $n \neq 0$, we can still use the unique F determined by the sewing equation and the normalization conditions above, but then we must compose F with an easily determined superprojective transformation in order to obtain a canonical supersphere.

Thus the real work needed to obtain a canonical supersphere from the sewing of two canonical superspheres is in solving for F using the sewing equation and the normalization conditions. The existence and uniqueness of a solution for F, i.e., a solution to the sewing equation and the normalization conditions, are guaranteed by Propositions 2.15 and 2.20.

We give two special examples. Define the superconformal shift

$$\begin{array}{rcl} s_{(z_i,\theta_i)} : \bigwedge_\infty & \longrightarrow & \bigwedge_\infty \\ (w,\rho) & \mapsto & (w - z_i - \rho\theta_i, \rho - \theta_i). \end{array}$$

If $\hat{H}_0(w,\rho) = I(w,\rho) = (1/w, i\rho/w)$, then [3]

$$F^{(1)}_{\Delta}(w,\rho) = s_{(z_i,\theta_i)}(w,\rho) \tag{2.54}$$

$$F^{(2)}_{\Delta}(w,\rho) = s_{(z_i,\theta_i)} \circ H_i^{-1}(w,\rho). \tag{2.55}$$

If $H_i(w,\rho) = (a_\square^2(w - z_i - \rho\theta_i), a_\square(\rho - \theta))$ for $a_\square \in (\bigwedge_\infty^0)^\times$, then

$$\begin{aligned} F^{(1)}_{\Delta}(w,\rho) = \; & \Biggl(a_\square^{-2}\left(\hat{H}_0^{-1} \circ I(a_\square^2(w - z_i - \rho\theta_i), a_\square(\rho - \theta))\right)^0, \\ & a_\square^{-1}\left(\hat{H}_0^{-1} \circ I(a_\square^2(w - z_i - \rho\theta_i), a_\square(\rho - \theta))\right)^1 \Biggr) \end{aligned} \tag{2.56}$$

$$F^{(2)}_{\Delta}(w,\rho) = \left(a_\square^{-2} w, a_\square^{-1}\rho\right). \tag{2.57}$$

We call the conditions (2.54) – (2.57) the *boundary conditions* for F.

As with the nonsuper case (see [**H2**]), this naturally leads to several questions: How does F depend on the local coordinates at the punctures being sewn, i.e., how does F depend on $\hat{H}_0$ and H_i? Is this dependence analytic or even algebraic in some sense? In this case is it possible to find a solution for F directly and explicitly using the sewing equation, the normalization conditions, and the boundary conditions?

The answers to these last two questions is yes as will be shown in Chapters 3 and 4. In fact in Chapter 3, in a certain formal algebraic setting, we will solve for F directly and explicitly by showing that F depends on $\hat{H}_0$ and H_i algebraically in a certain sense, and that formally, F can be obtained uniquely using the sewing equation, the normalization conditions and the boundary conditions. Then in Chapter 4, we will prove that this dependence is also analytic in a certain sense, and that if the local coordinates $\hat{H}_0$ and H_i are convergent superconformal local coordinates, then F is a convergent superconformal function on the appropriate domain.

---

[3] There is a misprint in the analogous nonsuper case to equations (2.54) and (2.55) given in [**H2**]. Equations (1.4.9) and (1.4.10) in [**H2**] should be $F^{(1)}(w) = w - z_i$ and $F^{(2)}(w) = f_i^{-1}(w) - z_i$, respectively, not $F^{(1)}(w) = w$ and $F^{(2)}(w) = f_i^{-1}(w)$ as stated. The correction is necessary if $F^{(2)}$ is to satisfy the normalization condition (1.4.3) in the case that $z_i \neq 0$.

CHAPTER 3

A formal algebraic study of the sewing operation

In this chapter, we develop a formal theory of infinitesimal $N = 1$ superconformal transformations based on a representation of the $N = 1$ Neveu-Schwarz algebra of superconformal symmetries in terms of superderivations, and we use these results to solve a formal version of the sewing equation along with the normalization and boundary conditions introduced in Chapter 2, thus answering several of the questions posed in Chapter 2 regarding the sewing equation. This solution to the formal sewing equation and the normalization and boundary conditions gives an identity for certain exponentials of superderivations involving infinitely many formal variables. In addition, we prove two other identities which are related to certain sewings and which also involve certain exponentials of superderivations. These superderivations give a representation of the $N = 1$ Neveu-Schwarz algebra with central charge zero, and we use these identities for this representation to prove similar identities for the Neveu-Schwarz algebra itself and hence for any representation of the Neveu-Schwarz algebra. Thus we obtain a correspondence between the supergeometric sewing operation of Chapter 2 and certain identities on representations of the Neveu-Schwarz algebra.

The material in this chapter is algebraic and independent of the supergeometry studied in Chapter 2. However, the results of this chapter do of course have geometric motivation and meaning, and will be applied to the supergeometric setting in Chapter 4.

This chapter is organized as follows. In Section 3.1, we give some preliminary definitions and give two generalizations of the "automorphism property" from [**FLM**]. In Section 3.2, we develop a formal supercalculus, define what is meant by a formal $N = 1$ superconformal power series, and study the formal theory of superconformal local coordinate maps for a super-Riemann surface. Using formal exponentiation, we characterize certain formal superconformal local coordinate maps in terms of exponentials of superderivations with infinitely many formal variable coefficients. The proof of this characterization relies on the generalizations of the automorphism property proved in Section 3.1.

In Section 3.3, we introduce the formal sewing equation and solve this equation along with the formal normalization and boundary conditions in terms of exponentials of infinite series of certain superderivations. This answers in the affirmative some of the questions posed in Chapter 2. That is, we show that formally the uniformizing function giving a canonical supersphere with tubes from the sewing together of two canonical superspheres with tubes does depend on the local coordinates at the punctures where the two superspheres are being sewn, and that in a certain sense, this dependence is algebraic. In addition, we show that formally, this solution to the sewing equation gives an explicit solution for the uniformizing function. We do this by interpreting the sewing equation as a product of exponentials of certain infinite series of superderivations with formal variable coefficients and by showing that this product is equal to a different product of exponentials of superderivations with coefficients involving these formal variables. In addition, in Section 3.3, we prove two other identities expressing the exponentials of certain infinite series of superderivations with formal variable coefficients as a product of certain other exponentials. These identities relate to determining the resulting local coordinates of two particular sewings and are needed in [**B1**] to prove the isomorphism theorem.

In Section 3.4, we define the $N = 1$ Neveu-Schwarz algebra and point out that the superderivations we used in Sections 3.2 and 3.3 give a representation of the Neveu-Schwarz algebra with central charge zero. This shows that the Neveu-Schwarz algebra is the algebra of infinitesimal superconformal transformations. We briefly discuss the subalgebra of the Neveu-Schwarz algebra consisting of infinitesimal global superconformal transformations (i.e., infinitesimal superprojective transformations). In Section 3.5, we discuss modules for the Neveu-Schwarz algebra.

In Section 3.6, we generalize the identities obtained in Section 3.3 to general representations of the Neveu-Schwarz algebra. We obtain an additional formal series in infinitely many formal variables which is related to the central charge of the Neveu-Schwarz algebra. In Section 3.7, we give the corresponding identities for positive-energy representations of the Neveu-Schwarz algebra showing that the resulting series have certain nice properties. Thus we obtain a correspondence between the sewing identities occurring in the supergeometric setting and the analogous identities occurring in the algebraic setting of a positive-energy representation of the Neveu-Schwarz algebra, for instance an $N = 1$ Neveu-Schwarz vertex operator superalgebra (cf. [**B1**], [**B3**]).

3.1. An extension of the automorphism property

In this section we work over a field $\mathbb{F}$ of characteristic zero. Recall that the space $\mathrm{Der}\, A$ of all superderivations of A is a Lie sub-superalgebra of $\mathrm{End}\, A$. Note that $(\mathrm{Der}\, A)^0$ consists of ordinary derivations. Thus the following "automorphism property" (8.2.10) in [**FLM**] holds.

Proposition 3.1. *([**FLM**]) Let A be a superalgebra, $u, v \in A$, $T \in (\mathrm{Der}\, A)^0$, and y a formal variable commuting with A. Then*

$$e^{yT} \cdot (uv) = (e^{yT} \cdot u)(e^{yT} \cdot v). \tag{3.1}$$

An expression of the form e^x denotes the formal exponential series. In the proof of Proposition 3.5, we will need the following proposition which is a generalization of the automorphism property (3.1).

Proposition 3.2. *Let A be a superalgebra, $a \in A^0$, $u, v \in A$, $T \in (\mathrm{Der}\, A)^0$, and y a formal variable commuting with A. Then*

$$\begin{aligned} e^{y(a+T)} \cdot (uv) &= (e^{yT} \cdot u)(e^{y(a+T)} \cdot v) && (3.2)\\ &= (e^{y(a+T)} \cdot u)(e^{yT} \cdot v). && (3.3) \end{aligned}$$

Proposition 3.2 can be proven directly by expanding both sides of (3.3) and (3.2) as power series in y, comparing coefficients of y^n for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and using induction on n. This proof is given in [**B1**]. However, here we present the following alternate proof which is more Lie theoretic and which also appeared in [**B1**]. This approach was suggested by J. Lepowsky.

PROOF. Let $X_1, X_2, ..., X_k \in (\mathrm{End}\, A[[y]])^0$. Set

$$[X_1, X_2, ..., X_k] = [X_1, [X_2, \cdots, [X_{k-1}, X_k] \cdots]],$$

and let $[X_1^{(i_1)} X_2^{(i_2)} \cdots X_k^{(i_k)}]$ denote the iterated bracket starting with the sequence of i_1 of the X_1's then i_2 of the X_2's, etc. Then, if well defined, the Campbell-Baker-Hausdorff formula gives $e^{X_1} e^{X_2} = e^{C(X_1, X_2)}$ where

$$C(X_1, X_2) = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}_+} \sum_{\substack{i_1, \dots, i_k, j_1, \dots, j_k \in \mathbb{N} \\ i_r + j_r \geq 1}} \frac{(-1)^{k-1} [X_1^{(i_1)} X_2^{(j_1)} \cdots X_1^{(i_k)} X_2^{(j_k)}]}{k((i_1 + j_1) + \cdots + (i_k + j_k))(i_1! j_1! \cdots i_k! j_k!)},$$

(cf. [**Re**]). For any $b \in A^0$, let $l_b : A \rightarrow A$ be left multiplication by b. Then for $b, c \in A^0$

$$[l_b, T] = -l_{Tb}, \qquad \text{and} \qquad [l_b, l_c] = 0.$$

Thus for $i_k, j_k \in \{0, 1\}$, we have

$$[(l_a + T)^{(i_1)} T^{(j_1)} \cdots (l_a + T)^{(i_k)} T^{(j_k)}] = l_{T^{i_1 + j_1 + \cdots + i_k + j_k} a},$$

and

$$e^{y(l_a + T)} e^{-yT} = e^{y l_b}$$

where

$$b = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}_+} d_k y^{k-1} (T^{k-1} a)$$

for some $d_k \in A^0$ with $d_1 = 1$. Using the automorphism property (3.1), we have

$$\begin{aligned} e^{y(a+T)} \cdot (uv) &= e^{y(a+T)} e^{-yT} e^{yT} \cdot (uv) \\ &= e^{y l_b} e^{yT} \cdot (uv) \\ &= e^{y l_b} (e^{yT} \cdot u)(e^{yT} \cdot v) = (e^{y(a+T)} \cdot u)(e^{yT} \cdot v) \\ &= (e^{yT} \cdot u) e^{y l_b} (e^{yT} \cdot v) = (e^{yT} \cdot u)(e^{y(a+T)} \cdot v), \end{aligned}$$

as desired. □

3.2. Formal supercalculus and formal superconformal power series

Let R be a superalgebra over $\mathbb{Q}$ (with identity). Let x be a formal variable which commutes with all elements of R, and let φ be a formal variable which commutes with x and elements of R^0 and anti-commutes with elements of R^1 and itself. In general, we will use the term *even formal variable* to denote a formal variable which commutes with all formal variables and with all elements in any coefficient algebra. We will use the term *odd formal variable* to denote a formal variable which anti-commutes with all odd elements and commutes with all even elements in any coefficient algebra, and in addition, odd formal variables will all anti-commute with each other. Consequently, an odd formal variable has the property that its square is zero.

For a vector space V, and for even formal variables x_1, x_2,..., and odd formal variables φ_1, φ_2,..., consider the spaces

$$\begin{aligned} &V[[x_1, ..., x_m]][\varphi_1, ..., \varphi_n] \\ &\quad = \Big\{ \sum_{\substack{k_1, ..., k_m \in \mathbb{N} \\ l_1, ... l_n \in \mathbb{Z}_2}} a_{k_1,...,k_m,l_1,...,l_n} x_1^{k_1} \cdots x_m^{k_m} \varphi_1^{l_1} \cdots \varphi_n^{l_n} \Bigm| a_{k_1,...,k_m,l_1,...,l_n} \in V \Big\} \end{aligned}$$

and

$$V((x))[\varphi] = \Big\{ \sum_{n=N}^{\infty} a_n x^n + \varphi \sum_{n=N}^{\infty} b_n x^n \Bigm| N \in \mathbb{Z},\ a_n, b_n \in V \Big\} \subset V[[x, x^{-1}]][\varphi].$$

Then $R[[x_1, ..., x_m]][\varphi_1, ..., \varphi_n]$ is a $\mathbb{Z}_2$-graded vector space with sign function given by

$$\eta(a x_1^{k_1} \cdots x_m^{k_m} \varphi_1^{l_1} \cdots \varphi_n^{l_n}) = (\eta(a) + l_1 + \cdots + l_n) \bmod 2,$$

and $R((x))[\varphi]$ is a superalgebra as is $R((x^{-1}))[\varphi]$.

Define

$$D = \frac{\partial}{\partial \varphi} + \varphi \frac{\partial}{\partial x}. \tag{3.4}$$

Then D is an odd derivation in both $\mathrm{Der}(R((x))[\varphi])$ and $\mathrm{Der}(R((x^{-1}))[\varphi])$. Furthermore, D satisfies the super-Leibniz rule (2.2) for the product of any two elements in $R[[x, x^{-1}]][\varphi]$ if that product is well defined. Note that

$$D^2 = \frac{\partial}{\partial x}.$$

Recall that a superanalytic $(1,1)$-superfunction over $\bigwedge_{*>0}$, $H(z, \theta)$, has a Laurent expansion about z and θ (2.6) which is an element of $\bigwedge_{*>0}[[z, z^{-1}]][\theta]$. Taking a general coefficient superalgebra R, we can write a formal superfunction in one even formal variable and one odd formal variable over R as

$$H(x, \varphi) = (f(x) + \varphi \xi(x), \psi(x) + \varphi g(x)) \in (R[[x, x^{-1}]][\varphi])^0 \oplus (R[[x, x^{-1}]][\varphi])^1$$

where $f(x), g(x) \in R^0[[x, x^{-1}]]$, and $\xi(x), \psi(x) \in R^1[[x, x^{-1}]]$.

In Chapter 2, the operator $D = \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} + \theta \frac{\partial}{\partial z}$ was used to define the notion of superconformal $(1,1)$-superfunction over $\bigwedge_{*>0}$ which is a superanalytic $(1,1)$-function with the condition that it transform D homogeneously of degree one. This is equivalent to the conditions (2.11). Thus formally, we define a series $H(x, \varphi) = (f(x) + \varphi \xi(x), \psi(x) + \varphi g(x))$ in $R[[x, x^{-1}]][\varphi]$ to be *formally superconformal* if

$$\xi(x) = g(x)\psi(x), \quad \text{and} \quad g(x)^2 = \frac{\partial}{\partial x} f(x) + \psi(x) \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \psi(x) \tag{3.5}$$

with $g(x) + \varphi \psi'(x)$ not identically zero. Therefore a formal superconformal series is uniquely determined by an even formal series $f(x)$, an odd formal series $\psi(x)$ and a square root of the formal power series $f'(x) + \psi(x)\psi'(x)$. Since a formal series $H(x, \varphi) = (f(x) + \varphi \xi(x), \psi(x) + \varphi g(x))$ in $R[[x, x^{-1}]][\varphi]$ has the property that $\varphi H(x, \varphi) = \varphi(f(x), \psi(x))$, any formal superconformal series $H(x, \varphi) \in R[[x, x^{-1}]][\varphi]$ can be uniquely expressed by the formal series $\varphi H(x, \varphi) \in \varphi R[[x, x^{-1}]]$ and a square root for $f'(x) + \psi(x)\psi'(x) \in (R[[x, x^{-1}]][\varphi])^0$.

We introduce the notation $\tilde{x} = H^0(x, \varphi) = f(x) + \varphi\xi(x)$ for the even part of H and $\tilde{\varphi} = H^1(x, \varphi) = \psi(x) + \varphi g(x)$ for the odd part of H. Then for $H(x, \varphi) = (\tilde{x}, \tilde{\varphi})$, the condition (3.5) for H to be superconformal is equivalent to the condition

$$D\tilde{x} = \tilde{\varphi} D\tilde{\varphi}. \tag{3.6}$$

In Chapter 2, we began the study of the moduli space of superspheres with punctures and local superconformal coordinates vanishing at the punctures. The punctures on a supersphere with tubes can be thought of as being at $0 \in \bigwedge_\infty$, a non-zero point in $\bigwedge_\infty$, or at a distinguished point on the supersphere we denote by ∞. Since we can always shift a non-zero point in $\bigwedge_\infty$ to zero, all local superconformal coordinates vanishing at the punctures can be expressed as power series vanishing at zero composed with a shift or at infinity. Thus we want to study in more detail certain formal superconformal power series in $(xR[[x]] \oplus \varphi R[[x]]) \subset R[[x]][\varphi]$ or in $x^{-1}R[[x^{-1}]][\varphi]$ since these will include the formal superconformal coordinates over a superalgebra R vanishing at $(x, \varphi) = 0$ and $(x, \varphi) = (\infty, 0)$, respectively.

First restricting our attention to formal superconformal power series in $xR[[x]] \oplus \varphi R[[x]]$, we note that if $H(x, \varphi) \in (xR[[x]] \oplus \varphi R[[x]])$ is superconformal and the even part of the x coefficient in $H(x, \varphi)$ is one, i.e., if $\varphi H(x, \varphi) = \varphi(f(x), \psi(x))$ for $f(x) \in xR^0[[x]]$ and $\psi(x) \in R^1[[x]]$ such that $f(x)$ is of the form $f(x) = x + \sum_{j=1}^\infty a_j x^{j+1}$, then $f' + \psi\psi' \in \{1 + \sum_{n=1}^\infty c_n x^n \mid c_n \in R^0\}$. We define

$$\begin{aligned} \sqrt{} : \Big\{1 + \sum_{n=1}^\infty c_n x^n \;\Big|\; c_n \in R\Big\} \quad &\longrightarrow \quad \Big\{1 + \sum_{n=1}^\infty c_n x^n \;\Big|\; c_n \in R\Big\} \\ h(x) \quad &\mapsto \quad \sqrt{h(x)} \end{aligned} \tag{3.7}$$

to be the Taylor expansion of $\sqrt{h(x)}$ about $x = 0$ such that $\sqrt{1} = 1$. Note that $\sqrt{}$ as defined here is the unique square root defined on $\{1 + \sum_{n=1}^\infty c_n x^n \mid c_n \in R\}$ with range contained in $\{1 + \sum_{n=1}^\infty c_n x^n \mid c_n \in R\}$, and $-\sqrt{}$ is the unique square root defined on $\{1 + \sum_{n=1}^\infty c_n x^n \mid c_n \in R\}$ mapping into $\{-1 - \sum_{n=1}^\infty c_n x^n \mid c_n \in R\}$.

Any superconformal $H \in R[[x]][\varphi]$ with $\varphi H(x, \varphi) = \varphi(f(x), \psi(x))$ (i.e., determined by $f(x)$ and $\psi(x)$) for some $f(x), \psi(x) \in xR[[x]]$ and with the coefficient of x in $f(x)$ equal to one must have the form

$$H(x, \varphi) = \left(f(x) \pm \varphi\psi(x)\sqrt{f'(x)}, \psi(x) \pm \varphi\sqrt{f'(x) + \psi(x)\psi'(x)}\right). \tag{3.8}$$

We can distinguish between these two by specifying the even coefficient of φ. That is if H is superconformal, vanishing at zero and $\varphi H(x, \varphi) = \varphi(f(x), \psi(x))$ with the coefficient of x in $f(x)$ equal to one and the even coefficient of φ equal to one (resp., -1), then H must be of the form (3.8) with the positive (resp., negative) sign.

Note that from (3.8) it is clear that any superconformal function H is also completely determined by its even (or odd) part and a specification of square root. That is, given $\tilde{x} = H^0(x, \varphi)$ (or $\tilde{\varphi} = H^1(x, \varphi)$) and a specification of square root, one can recover f and ψ.

We wish to express any formal superconformal series vanishing at zero in terms of a formal exponential of an infinite sum of certain superderivations. For any even formal series $f(x) \in xR^0[[x]]$ with x coefficient one, and any odd formal series $\psi(x) \in xR^1[[x]]$, we first express $\varphi(f(x), \psi(x)) \in \varphi xR[[x]]$ in terms of φ times the exponential of an infinite sum of superderivations in $\mathrm{Der}(R((x))[\varphi])$ acting on (x, φ). Then we prove that this exponential of superderivations is in fact superconformal with even coefficient of φ equal to one and that there is a one-to-one correspondence between such exponential expressions and formal superconformal power series in $R[[x]][\varphi]$ vanishing at $(x, \varphi) = 0$ with even coefficient of the x and φ terms equal to one. To do this, we will want to introduce more formal variables.

Let $\mathcal{A}_j$, for $j \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, be even formal variables, and let $\mathcal{M}_{j-1/2}$, for $j \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, be odd formal variables. Let $\mathcal{A} = \{\mathcal{A}_j\}_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}$ and $\mathcal{M} = \{\mathcal{M}_{j-1/2}\}_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}$, and consider the $\mathbb{Q}$-superalgebra $\mathbb{Q}[\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{M}]$ of polynomials in the formal variables $\mathcal{A}_1, \mathcal{A}_2, ...$ and $\mathcal{M}_{1/2}, \mathcal{M}_{3/2}, ...$ Consider the even superderivations

$$L_j(x, \varphi) = -\left(x^{j+1}\frac{\partial}{\partial x} + \left(\frac{j+1}{2}\right)\varphi x^j \frac{\partial}{\partial \varphi}\right) \tag{3.9}$$

and the odd superderivations

$$G_{j-\frac{1}{2}}(x, \varphi) = -x^j\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \varphi} - \varphi\frac{\partial}{\partial x}\right) \tag{3.10}$$

in $\mathrm{Der}(R((x))[\varphi])$, for $j \in \mathbb{Z}_+$. We define the sequences

$$E^0(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{M}) = \{E_j(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{M})\}_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+} \qquad \text{and} \qquad E^1(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{M}) = \left\{E_{j-\frac{1}{2}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{M})\right\}_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}$$

of even and odd elements, respectively, in $\mathbb{Q}[\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{M}]$ by

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi\Big(x + \sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+} E_j(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{M})x^{j+1}, \sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+} E_{j-\frac{1}{2}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{M})x^j\Big) \\ = \varphi \exp\Bigg(-\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}\Big(\mathcal{A}_j L_j(x, \varphi) + \mathcal{M}_{j-\frac{1}{2}} G_{j-\frac{1}{2}}(x, \varphi)\Big)\Bigg) \cdot (x, \varphi). \end{aligned} \tag{3.11}$$

As usual, "exp" denotes the formal exponential series, when it is defined, as it is in the case of the above exponential of the derivation in Der $(\mathbb{Q}[\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{M}][[x]][\varphi])$. The reason for the φ multiplier in (3.11), is that we are in fact uniquely defining a series

$$(f(x), \psi(x)) = \Bigg(x + \sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+} E_j(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{M})x^{j+1}, \sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+} E_{j-\frac{1}{2}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{M})x^j\Bigg)$$

in $x\mathbb{Q}[\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{M}][[x]]$ by means of φ times a certain series in $\mathbb{Q}[\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{M}][[x]][\varphi]$. From (3.11), we see that, for $j \in \mathbb{Z}_+$,

$$E_j(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{M}) = \mathcal{A}_j + r_j^0(\mathcal{A}_1, ..., \mathcal{A}_{j-1}, \mathcal{M}_{\frac{1}{2}}..., \mathcal{M}_{j-\frac{3}{2}}), \tag{3.12}$$

and

$$E_{j-\frac{1}{2}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{M}) = \mathcal{M}_{j-\frac{1}{2}} + r_j^1(\mathcal{A}_1, ..., \mathcal{A}_{j-1}, \mathcal{M}_{\frac{1}{2}}, ..., \mathcal{M}_{j-\frac{3}{2}}) \tag{3.13}$$

where $r_j^0(\mathcal{A}_1, ..., \mathcal{A}_{j-1}, \mathcal{M}_{1/2}, ..., \mathcal{M}_{j-3/2})$, and $r_j^1(\mathcal{A}_1, ..., \mathcal{A}_{j-1}, \mathcal{M}_{1/2}, ..., \mathcal{M}_{j-3/2})$ are in $\mathbb{Q}[\mathcal{A}_1, ..., \mathcal{A}_{j-1}, \mathcal{M}_{1/2}, ..., \mathcal{M}_{j-3/2}]$, both with constant term zero.

Let R be a superalgebra over $\mathbb{Q}$. Let $(R^0)^\infty$ be the set of all sequences $\{A_j\}_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}$ of even elements in R, let $(R^1)^\infty$ be the set of all sequences $\{M_{j-1/2}\}_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}$ of odd elements in R, and let $R^\infty = (R^0)^\infty \oplus (R^1)^\infty$. Given any

$$(A, M) = \left(\{A_j\}_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}, \{M_{j-\frac{1}{2}}\}_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}\right) = \left\{(A_j, M_{j-\frac{1}{2}})\right\}_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+} \in R^\infty,$$

we have a well-defined sequence $E(A, M) = (E^0(A, M), E^1(A, M))$ in R^∞ by substituting A and M into $E^0(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{M})$ and $E^1(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{M})$, respectively, since $E_j(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{M})$ and

$E_{j-\frac{1}{2}}(\mathcal{A},\mathcal{M})$ are in $\mathbb{Q}[\mathcal{A},\mathcal{M}]$ for $j\in\mathbb{Z}_+$. This defines a map

$$\begin{array}{rcrcl} E : R^\infty & \longrightarrow & R^\infty & = & (R^0)^\infty \oplus (R^1)^\infty \\ (A,M) & \mapsto & E(A,M) & = & \big(E^0(A,M), E^1(A,M)\big). \end{array}$$

Proposition 3.3. *The map E is a bijection. In particular, E has an inverse E^{-1}.*

Proof. Given $(a,m)\in R^\infty$ consider the infinite system of equations

$$(E^0(A,M),E^1(A,M)) = (a,m) \tag{3.14}$$

for the unknown sequence $(A,M) = \{(A_j, M_{j-1/2})\}_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}$. Define $\mathcal{E}_{2l}(A,M) = E_l(A,M)$, and $\mathcal{E}_{2l+1}(A,M) = E_{l-\frac{1}{2}}(A,M)$ for $l\in\mathbb{Z}_+$. Then the infinite system of equations (3.14) becomes a system of equations for $\mathcal{E}_k(A,M)$, and using (3.12) and (3.13), it is easy to show by induction on $k=1,2,...$, that this system of equations has a unique solution, i.e.,

$$\begin{array}{rcl} (A,M) \;=\; E^{-1}(a,m) & = & \big((E^{-1})^0(a,m),(E^{-1})^1(a,m)\big) \\ & = & \Big(\big\{(E^{-1})_j(a,m)\big\}_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}, \big\{(E^{-1})_{j-\frac{1}{2}}(a,m)\big\}_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}\Big) \;\in R^\infty. \end{array}$$

The proposition follows immediately. □

Corollary 3.4. *For any formal power series of the form*

$$(f(x),\psi(x)) = \left(x + \sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+} a_j x^{j+1}, \sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+} m_{j-\frac{1}{2}} x^j\right) \in x\left(R^0[[x]]\oplus R^1[[x]]\right), \tag{3.15}$$

we have

$$\varphi f(x) = \varphi \exp\left(-\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}\Big(E_j^{-1}(a,m)L_j(x,\varphi) + E^{-1}_{j-\frac{1}{2}}(a,m)G_{j-\frac{1}{2}}(x,\varphi)\Big)\right)\cdot x,$$

and

$$\varphi \psi(x) = \varphi \exp\left(-\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}\Big(E_j^{-1}(a,m)L_j(x,\varphi) + E^{-1}_{j-\frac{1}{2}}(a,m)G_{j-\frac{1}{2}}(x,\varphi)\Big)\right)\cdot \varphi$$

where $E_j^{-1}(a,m)$ and $E^{-1}_{j-1/2}(a,m)$, for $j\in\mathbb{Z}_+$, denote the even and odd components of the series $E^{-1}(a,m) = \{E_j^{-1}(a,m), E^{-1}_{j-1/2}(a,m)\}_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}\in R^\infty$, respectively.

Proof. Using equation (3.11) and the fact that E is a bijection, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &(\varphi f(x), \varphi\psi(x)) \\ &\quad = \varphi\Big(x + \sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+} a_j x^{j+1}, \sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+} m_{j-\frac{1}{2}}x^j\Big) \\ &\quad = \varphi\Big(x + \sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+} E_j(E^{-1}(a,m))x^{j+1}, \sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+} E_{j-\frac{1}{2}}(E^{-1}(a,m))x^j\Big) \\ &\quad = \varphi\exp\left(-\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}\Big(E_j^{-1}(a,m)L_j(x,\varphi) + E^{-1}_{j-\frac{1}{2}}(a,m)G_{j-\frac{1}{2}}(x,\varphi)\Big)\right)\cdot(x,\varphi). \end{aligned}$$

□

PROPOSITION 3.5. *Let R be a superalgebra and*

$$(A, M) = \{(A_j, M_{j-1/2})\}_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+} \in (R^0)^\infty \oplus (R^1)^\infty = R^\infty.$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned}H(x,\varphi) &= \exp\Biggl(-\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}\Bigl(A_jL_j(x,\varphi) + M_{j-\frac{1}{2}}G_{j-\frac{1}{2}}(x,\varphi)\Bigr)\Biggr)\cdot(x,\varphi) \\ &= \exp\Biggl(\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}\Biggl(A_j\Bigl(x^{j+1}\frac{\partial}{\partial x} + \Bigl(\frac{j+1}{2}\Bigr)\varphi x^j\frac{\partial}{\partial\varphi}\Bigr) \\ &\qquad\qquad + M_{j-\frac{1}{2}}x^j\Bigl(\frac{\partial}{\partial\varphi} - \varphi\frac{\partial}{\partial x}\Bigr)\Biggr)\Biggr)\cdot(x,\varphi)\end{aligned} \tag{3.16}$$

is superconformal and is the unique formal superconformal power series in $R[[x]][\varphi]$ with even coefficient of φ equal to one such that

$$\varphi H(x,\varphi) = \varphi\Biggl(x + \sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}E_j(A,M)x^{j+1}, \sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}E_{j-\frac{1}{2}}(A,M)x^j\Biggr).$$

PROOF. Let

$$T = -\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}\Bigl(A_jL_j(x,\varphi) + M_{j-\frac{1}{2}}G_{j-\frac{1}{2}}(x,\varphi)\Bigr). \tag{3.17}$$

Then $T \in (\mathrm{Der}(R[[x]][\varphi]))^0$, i.e., T is even, and thus

$$e^T\cdot(x,\varphi) = (e^T\cdot x, e^T\cdot\varphi) \in (R[[x]][\varphi])^0 \oplus (R[[x]][\varphi])^1.$$

Let

$$h(x,\varphi) = \sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}\Bigl(A_j\Bigl(\frac{j+1}{2}\Bigr)x^j + \varphi M_{j-\frac{1}{2}}jx^{j-1}\Bigr).$$

Then $h \in (R[[x]][\varphi])^0$, i.e., h is even, and we have

$$[D, T] = h(x,\varphi)D.$$

Thus

$$De^T\cdot x = e^{(h+T)}\cdot D\cdot x = e^{(h+T)}\cdot\varphi.$$

By Proposition 3.2,

$$e^{y(h+T)}\cdot\varphi = e^{y(h+T)}\cdot(\varphi 1) = \bigl(e^{yT}\cdot\varphi\bigr)\bigl(e^{y(h+T)}\cdot 1\bigr). \tag{3.18}$$

But in this case, the coefficient of y^n for a fixed $n \in \mathbb{N}$ has terms with powers of x greater than or equal to $n-1$. Thus we can set $y = 1$, and each power series in equation (3.18) has only a finite number of x^j terms for a given $j \in \mathbb{N}$, i.e., each term is a well-defined power series in x. Therefore

$$e^{(h+T)}\cdot\varphi = \bigl(e^T\cdot\varphi\bigr)\bigl(e^{(h+T)}\cdot 1\bigr).$$

Thus writing $H(x,\varphi) = (e^T\cdot x, e^T\cdot\varphi) = (\tilde{x},\tilde{\varphi})$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}D\tilde{x} &= e^{(h+T)}\cdot\varphi \;=\; \bigl(e^T\cdot\varphi\bigr)\bigl(e^{(h+T)}\cdot 1\bigr) \\ &= \bigl(e^T\cdot\varphi\bigr)\bigl(e^{(h+T)}\cdot D\cdot\varphi\bigr) \;=\; \bigl(e^T\cdot\varphi\bigr)\bigl(De^T\cdot\varphi\bigr) \\ &= \tilde{\varphi}D\tilde{\varphi}\end{aligned}$$

which proves that H satisfies the superconformal condition (3.6). The uniqueness follows from Proposition 3.3, the uniqueness of $\sqrt{}$ on $\{1 + \sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}_+}c_nx^n \mid c_n \in$

$R\}$, and the fact that if we write $H = (f(x) + \varphi\xi(x), \psi(x) + \varphi g(x))$ then from equation (3.16), we can directly observe that $g(x)$ is of the form $g(x) = 1 + \sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+} A_j \left(\frac{j+1}{2}\right) x^j +$ (terms in powers of x strictly greater than 1), i.e., $g(x) \in \{1 + \sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}_+} c_n x^n \mid c_n \in R\}$. □

REMARK 3.6. Here we note a difference between the super and nonsuper cases. In the nonsuper case (see [**H2**]), the fact that

$$\exp\Big(\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+} A_j x^{j+1}\frac{\partial}{\partial x}\Big)\cdot x,$$

for $A_j \in \mathbb{C}$, gives a formal analytic function is trivial. However, in the super case, as one can observe from the necessary machinery involved in the proof of Proposition 3.5, the proof that the analogous expression involving superderivations (3.16) is superconformal is highly nontrivial.

REMARK 3.7. That T as defined by (3.17) is an even superderivation is due to the fact that T exists in the R-envelope of $\mathrm{Der}(\mathbb{C}[[x]][\varphi])$; see Remark 2.1. Indeed in the work that follows, much of our ability to extend Huang's methods in [**H1**] and [**H2**] to the $N = 1$ super case relies on this fact – that we are working in the envelope of a Lie superalgebra which, by definition, is an ordinary Lie algebra.

Now we would like to include formal superconformal power series vanishing at zero with the even part of the coefficient of x not necessarily one. For $b \in R^0$, we define the linear operators $b^{2x\frac{\partial}{\partial x}}$ and $b^{\varphi\frac{\partial}{\partial\varphi}}$ from $R[x, x^{-1}, \varphi]$ to itself by

$$\begin{aligned} b^{2x\frac{\partial}{\partial x}}\cdot c\varphi^m x^n &= c\varphi^m b^{2n} x^n \\ b^{\varphi\frac{\partial}{\partial\varphi}}\cdot c\varphi^m x^n &= c b^m \varphi^m x^n \end{aligned}$$

for $c \in R$, $m \in \mathbb{Z}_2$, and $n \in \mathbb{Z}$. Then the operator $b^{\left(2x\frac{\partial}{\partial x} + \varphi\frac{\partial}{\partial\varphi}\right)} = b^{2x\frac{\partial}{\partial x}} b^{\varphi\frac{\partial}{\partial\varphi}}$ is a well-defined linear operator on $R[x, x^{-1}, \varphi]$. These operators can be extended to operators on $R[[x, x^{-1}]][\varphi]$ in the obvious way. We note that for $H(x,\varphi) \in R[[x, x^{-1}]][\varphi]$, we have

$$b^{\left(2x\frac{\partial}{\partial x} + \varphi\frac{\partial}{\partial\varphi}\right)}\cdot H(x,\varphi) \;=\; H(b^{\left(2x\frac{\partial}{\partial x} + \varphi\frac{\partial}{\partial\varphi}\right)}\cdot(x,\varphi)) \;=\; H(b^2x, b\varphi). \tag{3.19}$$

If H is of the form (3.16), in order for $H(b^2x, b\varphi)$ to correspond to an invertible local coordinate chart vanishing at zero, we must have $b \in (R^0)^\times$, i.e., b must be an invertible even element of the underlying superalgebra R.

REMARK 3.8. The operation $b^{\left(2x\frac{\partial}{\partial x} + \varphi\frac{\partial}{\partial\varphi}\right)}\cdot H(x,\varphi)$ for H a power series of the form (3.16), results in a formal power series vanishing at zero with the even part of the coefficient of x equal to b^2 and the even part of the coefficient of φ equal to b. Thus, in keeping with the notation that the even coefficient of x^{j+1} in $f(x)$ is denoted by a_j, the coefficient b^2 can be thought of as a_0 and b can be thought of as a square root of a_0. In [**B1**] and [**B2**], we assumed a well-defined square root on $(R^0)^\times$, which is equivalent to choosing a branch cut for the complex logarithm when $R = \bigwedge_*$ (cf. Remark 2.9). We used the notation a_0 and $\sqrt{a_0}$, making it necessary to keep track of what square root was being used, or we used "$\sqrt{a_0}$" as a composite symbol to denote a specified element of $(R^0)^\times$ such that $\sqrt{a_0}^2 = a_0$. However, it is more natural to give $\sqrt{a_0} = b$, an invertible even element of R, as the basic data avoiding the need to keep track of a well-defined square root on $(R^0)^\times$.

In order to avoid confusion as to whether $\sqrt{a_0}$ is a specified element of $(R^0)^\times$ or some well-defined square root of an element in $(R^0)^\times$, we will use the notation $a_\square \in (R^0)^\times$ as our basic data such that $a_\square$ is the even coefficient of φ and $a_\square^2$ is the even coefficient of x in $a_\square^{\left(2x\frac{\partial}{\partial x}+\varphi\frac{\partial}{\partial \varphi}\right)} \cdot H(x,\varphi)$ for H a power series of the form (3.16).

Extending the notation (3.9) to $j = 0$, let

$$L_0(x,\varphi) = -\left(x\frac{\partial}{\partial x} + \frac{1}{2}\varphi\frac{\partial}{\partial \varphi}\right),$$

which is an even superderivation in $\mathrm{Der}(R[[x,x^{-1}]][\varphi])$.

Proposition 3.9. *Let* $a_\square \in (R^0)^\times$. *Then*

$$a_\square^{-2L_0(x,\varphi)} \cdot (x,\varphi) = a_\square^{\left(2x\frac{\partial}{\partial x}+\varphi\frac{\partial}{\partial \varphi}\right)} \cdot (x,\varphi) = \left(a_\square^2 x, a_\square \varphi\right) \tag{3.20}$$

is superconformal.

Proof. Writing $a_\square^{-2L_0(x,\varphi)} \cdot (x,\varphi) = (\tilde{x},\tilde{\varphi})$, we have

$$D\tilde{x} = D \cdot (a_\square^2 x) = \varphi a_\square^2 = (a_\square\varphi)(a_\square) = \tilde{\varphi}D\tilde{\varphi}.$$

$\square$

Note that the operator $a_\square^{-2L_0(x,\varphi)}$ should not be read as $(a_\square^{-2})^{L_0(x,\varphi)}$ but as $a_\square^{\left(2x\frac{\partial}{\partial x}+\varphi\frac{\partial}{\partial \varphi}\right)}$ thus retaining the basic data $a_\square$ rather than just $a_\square^2$; see Remark 3.8.

For any $(A,M) \in R^\infty$, we define a map $\tilde{E}$ from R^∞ to the set of all formal superconformal power series in $xR[[x]][\varphi]$ with leading even coefficient of φ equal to one, by defining

$$\varphi\tilde{E}^0(A,M)(x,\varphi) = \varphi\left(x + \sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+} E_j(A,M)x^{j+1}\right), \tag{3.21}$$

$$\varphi\tilde{E}^1(A,M)(x,\varphi) = \varphi\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+} E_{j-\frac{1}{2}}(A,M)x^j, \tag{3.22}$$

and letting $\tilde{E}(A,M)(x,\varphi)$ be the unique formal superconformal power series with even coefficient of φ equal to one such that

$$\varphi(\tilde{E}(A,M)(x,\varphi)) = \varphi(\tilde{E}^0(A,M),\tilde{E}^1(A,M)).$$

For $a_\square \in (R^0)^\times$, we define a map $\hat{E}$ from $(R^0)^\times \times R^\infty$ to the set of all formal superconformal power series in $xR[[x]][\varphi]$ with invertible leading even coefficient of φ, by defining

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{E}^0(a_\square,A,M)(x,\varphi) &= a_\square^2\tilde{E}^0(A,M)(x,\varphi),\\ \hat{E}^1(a_\square,A,M)(x,\varphi) &= a_\square\tilde{E}^1(A,M)(x,\varphi),\end{aligned}$$

and setting

$$\hat{E}(a_\square,A,M)(x,\varphi) = (\hat{E}^0(a_\square,A,M)(x,\varphi),\hat{E}^1(a_\square,A,M)(x,\varphi)).$$

Then $\hat{E}(a_\square,A,M)(x,\varphi)$ is the unique formal superconformal power series satisfying

$$\varphi(\hat{E}(a_\square,A,M)(x,\varphi)) = \varphi(\hat{E}^0(a_\square,A,M),\hat{E}^1(a_\square,A,M))$$

with even coefficient of φ equal to $a_\square$. The following proposition is an immediate consequence of Propositions 3.3, 3.5, and 3.9.

PROPOSITION 3.10. *The map $\hat{E}$ from $(R^0)^\times \times R^\infty$ to the set of all formal superconformal power series $H(x,\varphi)$ of the form*

$$\varphi H(x,\varphi) = \varphi\Bigg(a_\square^2\Big(x + \sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+} a_j x^{j+1}\Big), a_\square \sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+} m_{j-\frac{1}{2}} x^j\Bigg) \tag{3.23}$$

and with even coefficient of φ equal to $a_\square$ for $(a_\square, a, m) \in (R^0)^\times \times R^\infty$, is a bijection.

The map $\tilde{E}$ from R^∞ to the set of formal superconformal power series of the form (3.23) with $a_\square = 1$ and even coefficient of φ equal to 1 is also a bijection.

In particular, we have inverses $\tilde{E}^{-1}$ and $\hat{E}^{-1}$.

We will use the notation:

$$T_H(x,\varphi) = -\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}\Big(E_j^{-1}(a,m)L_j(x,\varphi) + E_{j-\frac{1}{2}}^{-1}(a,m)G_{j-\frac{1}{2}}(x,\varphi)\Big)$$

for $H(x,\varphi)$ formally superconformal of the form (3.23) with even coefficient of φ equal to $a_\square$. Thus any superconformal power series $H(x,\varphi)$ of this form can be written uniquely as

$$H(x,\varphi) = e^{T_H(x,\varphi)} \cdot a_\square^{-2L_0(x,\varphi)} \cdot (x,\varphi). \tag{3.24}$$

Recalling (2.36), we know that a local superconformal coordinate map vanishing at $0 \in \bigwedge_{*>0}$ with $\rho H(w,\rho) = \rho(f(w),\psi(w))$ is completely determined by $f(w)$, $\psi(w)$ and a choice of square root for $f'(w) + \psi(w)\psi'(w)$, where $f(w)$ can be expanded in a power series of the form $a_\square^2(w + \sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+} a_j w^{j+1})$ with $a_j \in \bigwedge_{*>0}^0$ and $a_\square \in (\bigwedge_{*>0}^0)^\times$, and $\psi(w)$ can be expanded in a power series of the form $a_\square \sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+} m_{j-1/2} w^j$ with $m_{j-1/2} \in \bigwedge_*^1$, such that these power series are absolutely convergent to $f(w)$ and $\psi(w)$, respectively, in some neighborhood of zero. Thus we see that formal superconformal power series $H(x,\varphi)$ of the form (3.24) can be thought of as the "local formal superconformal coordinate maps vanishing at zero" or the "local formal superconformal coordinate transformations fixing the coordinates of a fixed point to be zero". From (3.24), we see that the "local formal superconformal transformations superanalytic and vanishing at zero" are generated uniquely by the "infinitesimal formal superconformal transformations" of the form

$$(\log a_\square)2L_0(x,\varphi) + \sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}\Big(A_j L_j(x,\varphi) + M_{j-\frac{1}{2}}G_{j-\frac{1}{2}}(x,\varphi)\Big)$$

(except for single-valuedness), for $a_\square \in (R^0)^\times$, and $\{(A_j, M_{j-1/2})\}_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+} \in R^\infty$. Proposition 3.10 states that these "infinitesimal superconformal transformations" can be identified with elements in $(R^0)^\times \times R^\infty$.

PROPOSITION 3.11. *Let $u, v \in R((x))[\varphi]$; let $(A, M) \in R^\infty$; and let*

$$\begin{aligned} T &= -\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}\Big(A_j L_j(x,\varphi) + M_{j-\frac{1}{2}}G_{j-\frac{1}{2}}(x,\varphi)\Big) \\ &= \sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}\bigg(A_j\Big(x^{j+1}\frac{\partial}{\partial x} + \Big(\frac{j+1}{2}\Big)\varphi x^j\frac{\partial}{\partial\varphi}\Big) + M_{j-\frac{1}{2}}x^j\Big(\frac{\partial}{\partial\varphi} - \varphi\frac{\partial}{\partial x}\Big)\bigg). \end{aligned} \tag{3.25}$$

Then

$$e^T \cdot (uv) = \left(e^T \cdot u\right)\left(e^T \cdot v\right). \tag{3.26}$$

In other words, for T, u, and v given above, the automorphism property, Proposition 3.1, holds if y is set equal to 1.

Proof. For $i \in \mathbb{Z}$, the term $\frac{y^n T^n}{n!} \cdot x^i$ has powers in x greater than or equal to $i+n-1$ for $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, and $\frac{y^n T^n}{n!} \cdot \varphi x^i$ has powers in x greater than or equal to $i+n$ for $n \geq 0$. Thus setting $y = 1$ in equation (3.1) of Proposition 3.1 applied to this case, each power series in equation (3.26) has only a finite number of x^j terms for a given $j \in \mathbb{Z}$, i.e., each term is a well-defined power series in $R((x))[\varphi]$. □

Proposition 3.12. *Let* $\overline{H}(x,\varphi) \in R((x))[\varphi]$, *and* $H(x,\varphi) = e^{T_H(x,\varphi)} \cdot (x,\varphi)$. *Then*

$$\overline{H}(H(x,\varphi)) = \overline{H}(e^{T_H(x,\varphi)} \cdot (x,\varphi)) = e^{T_H(x,\varphi)} \cdot \overline{H}(x,\varphi). \tag{3.27}$$

Proof. Write $H(x,\varphi) = e^{T_H} \cdot (x,\varphi) = (e^{T_H} \cdot x, e^{T_H} \cdot \varphi) = (\tilde{x}, \tilde{\varphi})$. Equation (3.27) is trivial for $\overline{H}(x,\varphi) = 1$, $\overline{H}(x,\varphi) = x$, and $\overline{H}(x,\varphi) = \varphi$.

(i) We prove the result for $\overline{H}(x,\varphi) = x^n$, with $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $n > 1$, by induction on n. Assume $e^{T_H} \cdot x^k = (e^{T_H} \cdot x)^k$ for $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $k < n$. Let $\overline{H}(x,\varphi) = x^n$. Then by Proposition 3.11,

$$\begin{aligned} e^{T_H} \cdot \overline{H}(x,\varphi) &= e^{T_H} \cdot (x x^{n-1}) = \left(e^{T_H} \cdot x\right)\left(e^{T_H} \cdot x^{n-1}\right) \\ &= \left(e^{T_H} \cdot x\right)\left(e^{T_H} \cdot x\right)^{n-1} = \tilde{x}\tilde{x}^{n-1} = \tilde{x}^n = \overline{H}(H(x,\varphi)). \end{aligned}$$

(ii) We next prove the result for $\overline{H}(x,\varphi) = x^{-n}$, $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$. Again by Proposition 3.11,

$$1 = e^{T_H} \cdot (x x^{-1}) = (e^{T_H} \cdot x)(e^{T_H} \cdot x^{-1}).$$

Thus

$$e^{T_H} \cdot x^{-1} = (e^{T_H} \cdot x)^{-1}.$$

Assume $e^{T_H} \cdot x^{-k} = (e^{T_H} \cdot x)^{-k}$ for $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $k < n$. Let $\overline{H}(x,\varphi) = x^{-n}$. Then by Proposition 3.11,

$$\begin{aligned} e^{T_H} \cdot \overline{H}(x,\varphi) &= e^{T_H} \cdot (x^{-1} x^{-(n-1)}) = \left(e^{T_H} \cdot x^{-1}\right)\left(e^{T_H} \cdot x^{-(n-1)}\right) \\ &= \left(e^{T_H} \cdot x\right)^{-1}\left(e^{T_H} \cdot x\right)^{-(n-1)} = \tilde{x}^{-1}\tilde{x}^{-(n-1)} = \tilde{x}^{-n} \\ &= \overline{H}(H(x,\varphi)). \end{aligned}$$

Thus the result is true for $\overline{H}(x,\varphi) = x^n$, $n \in \mathbb{Z}$.

(iii) For $\overline{H}(x,\varphi) = \varphi x^n$, $n \in \mathbb{Z}$, we note that by Proposition 3.11, and the above cases for $\overline{H}(x,\varphi) = x^n$, $n \in \mathbb{Z}$, and $\overline{H}(x,\varphi) = \varphi$,

$$\begin{aligned} e^{T_H} \cdot \overline{H}(x,\varphi) &= e^{T_H} \cdot (\varphi x^n) = \left(e^{T_H} \cdot \varphi\right)\left(e^{T_H} \cdot x^n\right) \\ &= \left(e^{T_H} \cdot \varphi\right)\left(e^{T_H} \cdot x\right)^n = \tilde{\varphi}\tilde{x}^n = \overline{H}(H(x,\varphi)). \end{aligned}$$

Since $e^{T_H} \cdot \varphi^i x^n \in R((x))[\varphi]$, for $i = 0, 1$ and $n \in \mathbb{Z}$, the result follows by linearity. □

Proposition 3.13. *Any formal superconformal power series* $H(x,\varphi)$ *of the form (3.24) has a unique inverse with respect to composition of formal power series, and this inverse is superconformal. That is, there exists a formal superconformal power series* $H^{-1}(x,\varphi)$ *of the form (3.24) such that*

$$H(H^{-1}(x,\varphi)) = (x,\varphi), \quad \textit{and} \quad H^{-1}(H(x,\varphi)) = (x,\varphi).$$

If $\hat{E}^{-1}(H(x,\varphi)) = (a_\square, A, M)$, *i.e.*,

(3.28)
$$H(x,\varphi) = \exp\Bigg(-\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}\Big(A_jL_j(x,\varphi) + M_{j-\frac{1}{2}}G_{j-\frac{1}{2}}(x,\varphi)\Big)\Bigg)\cdot a_\square^{-2L_0(x,\varphi)}\cdot(x,\varphi),$$

then

(3.29)
$$\begin{aligned} H^{-1}&(x,\varphi)\\ &= \exp\Bigg(\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}\Big(a_\square^{-2j}A_jL_j(x,\varphi) + a_\square^{-2j+1}M_{j-\frac{1}{2}}G_{j-\frac{1}{2}}(x,\varphi)\Big)\Bigg)\cdot\\ &\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\cdot a_\square^{2L_0(x,\varphi)}\cdot(x,\varphi)\\ &= a_\square^{2L_0(x,\varphi)}\cdot\exp\Bigg(\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}\Big(A_jL_j(x,\varphi) + M_{j-\frac{1}{2}}G_{j-\frac{1}{2}}(x,\varphi)\Big)\Bigg)\cdot(x,\varphi)\\ &= a_\square^{2L_0(x,\varphi)}\cdot\exp\left(-T_H(x,\varphi)\right)\cdot(x,\varphi)\ \in R[[x]][\varphi]. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. from (3.29) and Proposition 3.12, we have

$$\begin{aligned} H(&H^{-1}(x,\varphi))\\ &= H(H^{-1}(a_\square^2x_1, a_\square\varphi_1))\big|_{(x_1,\varphi_1)=(a_\square^{-2}x, a_\square^{-1}\varphi)}\\ &= H\Bigg(\exp\Bigg(\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}\Big(A_jL_j(x_1,\varphi_1) + M_{j-\frac{1}{2}}G_{j-\frac{1}{2}}(x_1,\varphi_1)\Big)\Bigg)\cdot\\ &\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\cdot(x_1,\varphi_1)\Bigg)\Bigg|_{(x_1,\varphi_1)=(a_\square^{-2}x, a_\square^{-1}\varphi)}\\ &= H(\exp\left(-T_H(x_1,\varphi_1)\right)\cdot(x_1,\varphi_1))\big|_{(x_1,\varphi_1)=(a_\square^{-2}x, a_\square^{-1}\varphi)}\\ &= \exp\left(-T_H(x_1,\varphi_1)\right)\cdot H(x_1,\varphi_1)\big|_{(x_1,\varphi_1)=(a_\square^{-2}x, a_\square^{-1}\varphi)}\\ &= \exp\left(-T_H(x_1,\varphi_1)\right)\cdot\exp\left(T_H(x_1,\varphi_1)\right)\cdot a_\square^{-2L_0(x_1,\varphi_1)}\cdot\\ &\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\cdot(x_1,\varphi_1))\big|_{(x_1,\varphi_1)=(a_\square^{-2}x, a_\square^{-1}\varphi)}\\ &= (a_\square^2x_1, a_\square\varphi_1)\big|_{(x_1,\varphi_1)=(a_\square^{-2}x, a_\square^{-1}\varphi)}\\ &= (x,\varphi). \end{aligned}$$

Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned}
&H^{-1}(H(x,\varphi))\\
&\quad= H^{-1}(H(a_{\square}^{-2}x_1, a_{\square}^{-1}\varphi_1))\big|_{(x_1,\varphi_1)=(a_{\square}^{2}x, a_{\square}\varphi)}\\
&\quad= H^{-1}\Bigg(\exp\Bigg(-\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}\Big(a_{\square}^{-2j}A_jL_j(x_1,\varphi_1)+a_{\square}^{-2j+1}M_{j-\frac{1}{2}}G_{j-\frac{1}{2}}(x_1,\varphi_1)\Big)\Bigg)\cdot\\
&\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\cdot(x_1,\varphi_1)\Bigg)\Bigg|_{(x_1,\varphi_1)=(a_{\square}^{2}x, a_{\square}\varphi)}\\
&\quad= H^{-1}\Big(a_{\square}^{2L_0(x_1,\varphi_1)}\cdot\exp\left(T_H(x_1,\varphi_1)\right)\cdot a_{\square}^{-2L_0(x_1,\varphi_1)}\cdot(x_1,\varphi_1)\Big)\Big|_{(x_1,\varphi_1)=(a_{\square}^{2}x, a_{\square}\varphi)}\\
&\quad= a_{\square}^{2L_0(x_1,\varphi_1)}\cdot\exp\left(T_H(x_1,\varphi_1)\right)\cdot a_{\square}^{-2L_0(x_1,\varphi_1)}\cdot H^{-1}(x_1,\varphi_1)\big|_{(x_1,\varphi_1)=(a_{\square}^{2}x, a_{\square}\varphi)}\\
&\quad= a_{\square}^{2L_0(x_1,\varphi_1)}\cdot\exp\left(T_H(x_1,\varphi_1)\right)\cdot a_{\square}^{-2L_0(x_1,\varphi_1)}\cdot a_{\square}^{2L_0(x_1,\varphi_1)}\cdot\\
&\qquad\qquad\qquad\cdot\exp\left(-T_H(x_1,\varphi_1)\right)\cdot(x_1,\varphi_1))\big|_{(x_1,\varphi_1)=(a_{\square}^{2}x, a_{\square}\varphi)}\\
&\quad= a_{\square}^{2L_0(x_1,\varphi_1)}\cdot(x_1,\varphi_1)\big|_{(x_1,\varphi_1)=(a_{\square}^{2}x, a_{\square}\varphi)}\\
&\quad= (x,\varphi).
\end{aligned}$$

Since the formal composition of two formal superconformal power series is again superconformal, by Propositions 3.5 and 3.9, $H^{-1}(x,\varphi)$ is superconformal. $\square$

Remark 3.14. from the proposition above, we see that the set of all formal superconformal power series of the form (3.24) with $a_{\square} = 1$ is a group with composition as the group operation. This is the group of "formal superconformal local coordinate transformations fixing the coordinates of a fixed point to be zero with leading even coefficient of φ equal to one" or the group of "formal superconformal transformations vanishing at zero with leading even coefficient of φ equal to one".

Given $(A,M),(B,N)\in R^{\infty}$, let $H(x,\varphi)$ and $\overline{H}(x,\varphi)$ be two formal superconformal power series of the form (3.16) such that

$$\tilde{E}^{-1}(H(x,\varphi)) = (A,M) \quad\text{and}\quad \tilde{E}^{-1}(\overline{H}(x,\varphi)) = (B,N). \tag{3.30}$$

We define the *composition* $(A,M)\circ(B,N)$ of (A,M), and (B,N) by

$$(A,M)\circ(B,N) = \tilde{E}^{-1}((\overline{H}\circ H)(x,\varphi)) \tag{3.31}$$

where $(\overline{H}\circ H)(x,\varphi)$ is the formal composition of $H(x,\varphi)$ and $\overline{H}(x,\varphi)$.

Proposition 3.15. *The set R^{∞} is a group with the operation $\circ$. Let $(A,M) = \{(A_j, M_{j-1/2})\}_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}\in R^{\infty}$, and for any $t\in R^0$, define*

$$t(A,M) = \{(tA_j, tM_{j-1/2})\}_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}.$$

Then for $s,t\in R^0$,

$$(s(A,M))\circ(t(A,M)) = (s+t)(A,M). \tag{3.32}$$

That is the map $t\mapsto t(A,M)$ is a homomorphism from the additive group of R^0 to R^{∞}. In addition, $(R^0)^{\infty}$ and $(R^1)^{\infty}$ are subgroups of R^{∞}.

Proof. Since the set of all formal superconformal power series of the form (3.16) is a group with composition as its group operation, it is obvious from the definition of $\circ$ that R^∞ is a group with this operation. Let $H_t(x,\varphi) = \tilde{E}(t(A,M))$. By Proposition 3.12

$$\begin{aligned} H_t(H_s(x,\varphi)) &= e^{T_{H_s}(x,\varphi)} \cdot H_t(x,\varphi) \\ &= e^{T_{H_s}(x,\varphi)} \cdot e^{T_{H_t}(x,\varphi)} \cdot (x,\varphi) \\ &= e^{sT_{H_1}(x,\varphi)} \cdot e^{tT_{H_1}(x,\varphi)} \cdot (x,\varphi) \\ &= e^{(s+t)T_{H_1}(x,\varphi)} \cdot (x,\varphi) \\ &= H_{(s+t)}(x,\varphi) \\ &= \tilde{E}((s+t)(A,M)). \end{aligned}$$

Or equivalently,

$$\tilde{E}^{-1}(H_t(H_s(x,\varphi)) = (s+t)(A,M).$$

But then from the definition of $s(A,M) \circ t(A,M)$,

$$\tilde{E}^{-1}(H_t(H_s(x,\varphi)) = s(A,M) \circ t(A,M).$$

Thus we obtain equation (3.32). Letting $\mathbf{0} = (\mathbf{0},\mathbf{0})$ be the sequence consisting of all zeros in R^∞, it is clear that $(R^0)^\infty \oplus \{\mathbf{0}\}$ and $(R^1)^\infty \oplus \{\mathbf{0}\}$ are subgroups of R^∞. [1] □

We can extend the composition $\circ$ defined by (3.31) to $(R^0)^\times \times R^\infty$. Given $(a_\Box, A, M), (b_\Box, B, N) \in (R^0)^\times \times R^\infty$, let $H(x,\varphi)$ and $\overline{H}(x,\varphi)$ be two formal superconformal power series of the form (3.28) such that

$$\hat{E}^{-1}(H(x,\varphi)) = (a_\Box, A, M) \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{E}^{-1}(\overline{H}(x,\varphi)) = (b_\Box, B, N).$$

Define

$$(a_\Box, A, M) \circ (b_\Box, B, N) \;=\; \hat{E}^{-1}((\overline{H} \circ H)(x,\varphi)). \tag{3.33}$$

Then in terms of the composition defined on R^∞ by (3.31), we have

$$(a_\Box, A, M) \circ (b_\Box, B, N) \;=\; \Big(a_\Box b_\Box, (A,M) \circ \big\{a_\Box^{2j} B_j, a_\Box^{2j-1} N_{j-\frac{1}{2}}\big\}_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}\Big). \tag{3.34}$$

Remark 3.16. With the composition operation defined above, $(R^0)^\times \times R^\infty$ is a group naturally isomorphic to the group of all formal superconformal power series of the form (3.28). The subset R^∞ is a subgroup of $(R^0)^\times \times R^\infty$ isomorphic to the group of all formal superconformal power series of the form (3.16). The fact that we can define a group action on $(R^0)^\times \times R^\infty$ allows us to study the group $(R^0)^\times \times R^\infty$ instead of the group of "formal superconformal local coordinate transformations fixing the coordinates of a fixed point to be zero".

We now want to consider the "formal superconformal coordinate maps vanishing at infinity." Let $H(x,\varphi) \in x^{-1}R[[x^{-1}]][\varphi]$ be superconformal with

$$\varphi H(x,\varphi) = \varphi\bigg(\frac{1}{x} + \sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+} a_j x^{-j-1}, \sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+} m_{j-\frac{1}{2}} x^{-j}\bigg) = \varphi(f(x),\psi(x)). \tag{3.35}$$

---

[1] There is a misprint in the analogous proof to Proposition 3.15 for the nonsuper case given in [**H2**]. In the proof of Proposition 2.1.14 in [**H2**], factoring out the t_1 and t_2 in the expressions $e^{l_{f_{t_1}(x)}}$ and $e^{l_{f_{t_2}(x)}}$ on the bottom line of p.46, one should obtain $e^{t_1 l_{f_1(x)}}$ and $e^{t_2 l_{f_1(x)}}$, not $e^{t_1 l_{f_0(x)}}$ and $e^{t_2 l_{f_0(x)}}$ as stated.

Then H must define a square root for

$$f'(x) + \psi(x)\psi'(x) \in \Big\{ -x^{-2} - \sum_{n=3}^{\infty} c_n x^{-n} \;\Big|\; c_n \in R \Big\}.$$

Let

$$1 + \sum_{m\in\mathbb{Z}_+} d_m x^m = \Big(1 + \sum_{n=3}^{\infty} c_n x^{n-2} \Big)^{1/2}$$

as defined by (3.7). The two possibilities for the square root that H must define for $f'(x) + \psi(x)\psi'(x) = -x^{-2} - \sum_{n=3}^{\infty} c_n x^{-n}$ are given by

$$\Big(-x^{-2} - \sum_{n=3}^{\infty} c_n x^{-n} \Big)^{1/2} \;=\; \pm\, \frac{i}{x} \Big(1 + \sum_{m\in\mathbb{Z}_+} d_m x^{-m} \Big).$$

That is, if $H \in x^{-1}R[[x^{-1}]][\varphi]$ is superconformal with leading even coefficient of x^{-1} equal to one, then

$$H(x,\varphi) = \Bigg(\frac{1}{x} + \sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+} a_j x^{-j-1} \pm \frac{i\varphi}{x} \Big(\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+} m_{j-\frac{1}{2}} x^{-j} \Big) \Big(1 + \sum_{m\in\mathbb{Z}_+} d_m x^{-m} \Big), \\ \sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+} m_{j-\frac{1}{2}} x^{-j} \pm \frac{i\varphi}{x} \Big(1 + \sum_{m\in\mathbb{Z}_+} d_m x^{-m} \Big) \Bigg). \tag{3.36}$$

Thus we can specify H of the form (3.36) by specifying $f(x)$, $\psi(x)$ and whether the even coefficient of φx^{-1} is i or $-i$.

Define

$$I(x,\varphi) = \Big(\frac{1}{x}, \frac{i\varphi}{x} \Big) \in x^{-1}R[[x^{-1}]][\varphi]. \tag{3.37}$$

Then I is superconformal of the form (3.36) with leading even coefficient of φx^{-1} equal to i, and $I^{-1} = (1/x, -i\varphi/x)$ is superconformal of the form (3.36) with even coefficient of φx^{-1} equal to $-i$.

We now want to use the results we have developed about formal superconformal series vanishing at zero to express any formal superconformal series vanishing at infinity and with even coefficient of φx^{-1} equal to i in terms of superderivations in $\mathrm{Der}(R((x^{-1}))[\varphi])$.

Let $H(x,\varphi)$ be superconformal of the form (3.36) with leading even coefficient of φx^{-1} equal to i, and let $H_{-1}(x,\varphi) = H \circ I^{-1}(x,\varphi)$. Then H_{-1} is superconformal satisfying (3.23) with $a_{\square} = 1$ and leading even coefficient of φ equal to one. Thus H_{-1} is of the form (3.24) with $a_{\square} = 1$ and has a well-defined compositional inverse $H_{-1}^{-1}(x,\varphi)$.

Note that $H \circ I^{-1} \circ H_{-1}^{-1}(x,\varphi)$, and $I^{-1} \circ H_{-1}^{-1} \circ H(x,\varphi)$ are well-defined formal superconformal series in $R[[x]][\varphi]$ and $xR[[x^{-1}]][\varphi]$, respectively. Moreover, it is clear that the compositional inverse of H is $H^{-1}(x,\varphi) = I^{-1} \circ H_{-1}^{-1}(x,\varphi) \in x^{-1}R[[x]][\varphi]$.

Recall the even and odd superderivations introduced in (3.9) and (3.10). Extending these definitions to include $L_{-j}(x,\varphi)$ and $G_{-j+1/2}(x,\varphi)$, for $j \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, we see that these are superderivations in $\mathrm{Der}(R((x^{-1}))[\varphi])$.

PROPOSITION 3.17. *Given $H(x,\varphi)$ superconformal of the form (3.36) with even coefficient of φx^{-1} equal to i, we have*

$$
\begin{aligned}
(3.38)\qquad H(x,\varphi) &= \exp\Bigg(\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}\big(E_j^{-1}(a,m)L_{-j}(x,\varphi)\\
&\qquad\qquad + iE^{-1}_{j-\frac{1}{2}}(a,m)G_{-j+\frac{1}{2}}(x,\varphi)\big)\Bigg)\cdot\Big(\frac{1}{x},\frac{i\varphi}{x}\Big)\\
&= \exp\Bigg(-\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}\Bigg(E_j^{-1}(a,m)\Big(x^{-j+1}\frac{\partial}{\partial x}+\Big(\frac{-j+1}{2}\Big)\varphi x^{-j}\frac{\partial}{\partial\varphi}\Big)\\
&\qquad\qquad + iE^{-1}_{j-\frac{1}{2}}(a,m)x^{-j+1}\Big(\frac{\partial}{\partial\varphi}-\varphi\frac{\partial}{\partial x}\Big)\Bigg)\Bigg)\cdot\Big(\frac{1}{x},\frac{i\varphi}{x}\Big)\\
&= \exp\Big(T_{H_{-1}}\Big(\frac{1}{x},\frac{i\varphi}{x}\Big)\Big)\cdot\Big(\frac{1}{x},\frac{i\varphi}{x}\Big).
\end{aligned}
$$

In addition, $H^{-1}(x,\varphi)=I^{-1}\circ H^{-1}_{-1}(x,\varphi)$ as defined above is the inverse of $H(x,\varphi)$ with respect to composition. That is,

$$H(H^{-1}(x,\varphi)) = H^{-1}(H(x,\varphi)) = (x,\varphi).$$

Moreover,

$$
\begin{aligned}
(3.39)\qquad H^{-1}\circ I(x,\varphi) &= H^{-1}\Big(\frac{1}{x},\frac{i\varphi}{x}\Big)\\
&= \exp\Bigg(-\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}\Big(E_j^{-1}(a,m)L_{-j}(x,\varphi)\\
&\qquad\qquad + iE^{-1}_{j-\frac{1}{2}}(a,m)G_{-j+\frac{1}{2}}(x,\varphi)\Big)\Bigg)\cdot(x,\varphi)\\
&= \exp\Big(-T_{H_{-1}}\Big(\frac{1}{x},\frac{i\varphi}{x}\Big)\Big)\cdot(x,\varphi).
\end{aligned}
$$

PROOF. Since H is superconformal satisfying (3.36) with even coefficient of φx^{-1} equal to i, the power series $H_{-1}(x,\varphi)=H\circ I^{-1}(x,\varphi)\in R[[x]][\varphi]$ is superconformal with

$$\varphi H_{-1}(x,\varphi)=\varphi\Big(x+\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}a_jx^{j+1},\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}m_{j-\frac{1}{2}}x^j\Big)$$

and with the even coefficient of φ equal to one. Thus by Proposition 3.5, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
H_{-1}(x,\varphi) &= \exp\Bigg(-\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}\big(E_j^{-1}(a,m)L_j(x,\varphi)\\
&\qquad\qquad + E^{-1}_{j-\frac{1}{2}}(a,m)G_{j-\frac{1}{2}}(x,\varphi)\big)\Bigg)\cdot(x,\varphi)\\
&= \exp(T_{H_{-1}}(x,\varphi))\cdot(x,\varphi).
\end{aligned}
$$

Write $I(x,\varphi) = (1/x, i\varphi/x) = (\tilde{x}, \tilde{\varphi})$. By the chain rule

$$ix^{-1}\frac{\partial}{\partial\tilde{\varphi}} = \frac{\partial\tilde{\varphi}}{\partial\varphi}\frac{\partial}{\partial\tilde{\varphi}} = \frac{\partial}{\partial\varphi} - \frac{\partial\tilde{x}}{\partial\varphi}\frac{\partial}{\partial\tilde{x}} = \frac{\partial}{\partial\varphi}$$

and

$$-x^{-2}\frac{\partial}{\partial\tilde{x}} = \frac{\partial\tilde{x}}{\partial x}\frac{\partial}{\partial\tilde{x}} = \frac{\partial}{\partial x} - \left(-\frac{\partial\tilde{\varphi}}{\partial x}\frac{\partial}{\partial\tilde{\varphi}}\right) = \frac{\partial}{\partial x} + \varphi x^{-1}\frac{\partial}{\partial\varphi}.$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned}
&H(x,\varphi) = H \circ I^{-1} \circ I(x,\varphi) = H \circ I^{-1}(\tilde{x},\tilde{\varphi}) = H_{-1}(\tilde{x},\tilde{\varphi}) \\
&\quad= \exp(T_{H_{-1}}(\tilde{x},\tilde{\varphi})) \cdot (\tilde{x},\tilde{\varphi}) \\
&\quad= \exp\Bigg(\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}\Bigg(E_j^{-1}(a,m)\Bigg(x^{-j-1}\Big(-x\varphi\frac{\partial}{\partial\varphi} - x^2\frac{\partial}{\partial x}\Big) \\
&\qquad\quad + \Big(\frac{j+1}{2}\Big)\frac{i\varphi}{x}x^{-j}\Big(-ix\frac{\partial}{\partial\varphi}\Big)\Bigg) + E^{-1}_{j-\frac{1}{2}}(a,m)x^{-j}\Big(-ix\frac{\partial}{\partial\varphi} \\
&\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad - \frac{i\varphi}{x}\Big(-x\varphi\frac{\partial}{\partial\varphi} - x^2\frac{\partial}{\partial x}\Big)\Big)\Bigg)\Bigg) \cdot \Big(\frac{1}{x}, \frac{i\varphi}{x}\Big) \\
&\quad= \exp\Bigg(-\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}\Bigg(E_j^{-1}(a,m)\Big(x^{-j+1}\frac{\partial}{\partial x} + \Big(\frac{-j+1}{2}\Big)\varphi x^{-j}\frac{\partial}{\partial\varphi}\Big) \\
&\qquad\qquad\qquad + E^{-1}_{j-\frac{1}{2}}(a,m)ix^{-j+1}\Big(\frac{\partial}{\partial\varphi} - \varphi\frac{\partial}{\partial x}\Big)\Bigg)\Bigg) \cdot \Big(\frac{1}{x}, \frac{i\varphi}{x}\Big)
\end{aligned}$$

which gives (3.38).

By Proposition 3.13, we know that $H_{-1}(x,\varphi)$ has a unique inverse $H_{-1}^{-1}(x,\varphi)$ with

$$\begin{aligned}
H_{-1}^{-1}(x,\varphi) &= \exp(T_{H_{-1}^{-1}}(x,\varphi)) \cdot (x,\varphi) \\
&= \exp\Bigg(-\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}\Bigg(E_j^{-1}(a,m)\Big(x^{j+1}\frac{\partial}{\partial x} + \Big(\frac{j+1}{2}\Big)\varphi x^j\frac{\partial}{\partial\varphi}\Big) \\
&\qquad\qquad + E^{-1}_{j-\frac{1}{2}}(a,m)x^j\Big(\frac{\partial}{\partial\varphi} - \varphi\frac{\partial}{\partial x}\Big)\Bigg)\Bigg)\cdot(x,\varphi) \\
&= \exp(-T_{H_{-1}}(x,\varphi)) \cdot (x,\varphi).
\end{aligned}$$

Setting $H^{-1}(x,\varphi) = I^{-1} \circ H_{-1}^{-1}(x,\varphi)$, and since $H(x,\varphi) = H_{-1} \circ I(x,\varphi)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
H \circ H^{-1}(x,\varphi) &= H_{-1} \circ I \circ I^{-1} \circ H_{-1}^{-1}(x,\varphi) &= (x,\varphi) \\
H^{-1} \circ H(x,\varphi) &= I^{-1} \circ H_{-1}^{-1} \circ H_{-1} \circ I(x,\varphi) &= (x,\varphi).
\end{aligned}$$

Moreover, by Proposition 3.12, with $\overline{H}(x,\varphi) = I^{-1}(x,\varphi)$ and $H(x,\varphi)$ in the Proposition replaced by $H_{-1}^{-1}(x,\varphi)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
H^{-1}\circ I(x,\varphi) &= I^{-1}\circ H_{-1}^{-1}\circ I(x,\varphi) \;=\; I^{-1}\circ H_{-1}^{-1}\Big(\frac{1}{x},\frac{i\varphi}{x}\Big)\\
&= I^{-1}\circ \exp\Big(-T_{H_{-1}}\Big(\frac{1}{x},\frac{i\varphi}{x}\Big)\Big)\cdot\Big(\frac{1}{x},\frac{i\varphi}{x}\Big)\\
&= \exp\Big(-T_{H_{-1}}\Big(\frac{1}{x},\frac{i\varphi}{x}\Big)\Big)\cdot I^{-1}\Big(\frac{1}{x},\frac{i\varphi}{x}\Big)\\
&= \exp\Big(-T_{H_{-1}}\Big(\frac{1}{x},\frac{i\varphi}{x}\Big)\Big)\cdot (x,\varphi)
\end{aligned}$$

which gives (3.39). □

REMARK 3.18. The formal superconformal power series of the form (3.38) can be thought of as the "formal superconformal local coordinate maps vanishing at $\infty = (\infty, 0)$".

The following two propositions are analogous to Proposition 3.11 and Proposition 3.12, respectively.

PROPOSITION 3.19. *Let* $u, v \in R((x^{-1}))[\varphi]$*; let* $(B,N) \in R^\infty$*; and let*

$$\begin{aligned}
\bar{T} &= -\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}\Big(B_jL_{-j}(x,\varphi) + N_{j-\frac{1}{2}}G_{-j+\frac{1}{2}}(x,\varphi)\Big) \qquad (3.40)\\
&= \sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}\Big(B_j\Big(x^{-j+1}\frac{\partial}{\partial x} + \Big(\frac{-j+1}{2}\Big)\varphi x^{-j}\frac{\partial}{\partial\varphi}\Big)\\
&\qquad\qquad + N_{j-\frac{1}{2}}x^{-j+1}\Big(\frac{\partial}{\partial\varphi} - \varphi\frac{\partial}{\partial x}\Big)\Big).
\end{aligned}$$

Then

$$e^{\bar{T}}\cdot(uv) = \Big(e^{\bar{T}}\cdot u\Big)\Big(e^{\bar{T}}\cdot v\Big). \qquad (3.41)$$

In other words, for $\bar{T}$, u, and v given above, the automorphism property, Proposition 3.1, holds if y is set equal to 1.

PROOF. For $i \in \mathbb{Z}$, and $j = 0, 1$, each $\frac{y^n\bar{T}^n}{n!}\cdot\varphi^j x^i$ has powers in x less than or equal to $i - n$ for $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Thus setting $y = 1$ in equation (3.1) of Proposition 3.1 applied to this case, each power series in equation (3.41) has only a finite number of x^j terms for a given $j \in \mathbb{Z}$, i.e., each term is a well-defined power series in $R((x^{-1}))[\varphi]$. □

PROPOSITION 3.20. *Let* $H(x,\varphi) = e^{\bar{T}}\cdot(x,\varphi)$ *with* $\bar{T}$ *given by (3.40), and let* $\overline{H}(x,\varphi) \in R((x^{-1}))[\varphi]$*. Then*

$$\overline{H}(H(x,\varphi)) = \overline{H}(e^{\bar{T}}\cdot(x,\varphi)) = e^{\bar{T}}\cdot\overline{H}(x,\varphi). \qquad (3.42)$$

PROOF. The proof is identical to steps (i), (ii), and (iii) in the proof of Proposition 3.12. To finish the proof, we only need note that since $e^{\bar{T}}\cdot\varphi^i x^n \in R((x^{-1}))[\varphi]$ for $i = 0, 1$ and $n \in \mathbb{Z}$, the result follows by linearity. □

Generalizing Propositions 3.12 and 3.20, we have the following proposition.

PROPOSITION 3.21. *If* $H, \overline{H} \in R[[x,x^{-1}]][\varphi]$ *with* $H(x,\varphi) = e^T \cdot (x,\varphi)$ *for some even superderivation* $T \in \mathrm{Der}(R[[x,x^{-1}]][\varphi])$ *such that* $Ta = 0$ *for* $a \in R$, *and if either* $\overline{H} \circ H(x,\varphi)$ *or* $e^T \cdot \overline{H}(x,\varphi)$ *exist in* $R[[x,x^{-1}]][\varphi]$, *then both exist in* $R[[x,x^{-1}]][\varphi]$ *and are equal.*

PROOF. We need only define the existence of the necessary expressions since the proof of equality is the same as that for Propositions 3.12 and 3.20.

Suppose $H(x,\varphi) = e^T \cdot (x,\varphi)$, $\overline{H}(x,\varphi)$ and $e^T \cdot \overline{H}(x,\varphi)$ exist in $R[[x,x^{-1}]][\varphi]$. Writing

$$\overline{H}(x,\varphi) = \sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}} a_n x^n + \varphi \sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}} b_n x^n$$

for $a_n, b_n \in R$, then

$$e^T \cdot \overline{H}(x,\varphi) = \sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}} a_n e^T \cdot x^n + \sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}} b_n e^T \cdot \varphi x^n.$$

Thus since $e^T \cdot \overline{H}(x,\varphi)$ exists in $R[[x,x^{-1}]][\varphi]$, and

$$\begin{aligned} e^T \cdot x^n &= \sum_{m\in\mathbb{N}} \frac{1}{m!} T^m x^n \\ e^T \cdot \varphi x^n &= \sum_{m\in\mathbb{N}} \frac{1}{m!} T^m \varphi x^n = \sum_{m\in\mathbb{N}} \frac{1}{m!} \sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z}} \binom{m}{k} (T^{m-k}\varphi)(T^k x^n), \end{aligned}$$

this implies that $T^m \cdot x^n$, for $a_n \neq 0$, and $T^m \cdot \varphi x^n$ for $b_n \neq 0$, exist in $R[[x,x^{-1}]][\varphi]$. By definition, for $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$

$$T^m x^n = \sum_{j_1+\cdots+j_n=m} \frac{m!}{j_1!\cdots j_n!} \prod_{l=1}^{n} \left(T^{j_l} x\right) \tag{3.43}$$

$$\begin{aligned} T^m \cdot \varphi x^n &= \sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}} \binom{m}{k} (T^{m-k}\varphi)(T^k x^n) \\ &= \sum_{j_1+\cdots+j_{n+1}=m} \frac{m!}{j_1!\cdots j_{n+1}!} (T^{j_{n+1}}\varphi) \prod_{l=1}^{n} \left(T^{j_l} x\right), \end{aligned} \tag{3.44}$$

and thus the right-hand sides of (3.43) and (3.44) must exist in $R[[x,x^{-1}]][\varphi]$ for $a_n \neq 0$ and $b_n \neq 0$, respectively. But then

$$\begin{aligned} (e^T \cdot x)^n &= \sum_{j_1,\ldots,j_n\in\mathbb{N}} \prod_{l=1}^{n} \left(\frac{1}{j_l!} T^{j_l} x\right) \\ &= \sum_{m\in\mathbb{N}} \frac{1}{m!} \sum_{j_1+\cdots+j_n=m} \frac{m!}{j_1!\cdots j_n!} \prod_{l=1}^{n} \left(T^{j_l} x\right) \\ &= e^T \cdot x^n \end{aligned} \tag{3.45}$$

and

$$
\begin{aligned}
(3.46)\quad & (e^T\cdot\varphi)(e^T\cdot x)^n \\
&= \left(\sum_{m\in\mathbb{N}}\frac{1}{m!}T^m\varphi\right)\left(\sum_{m\in\mathbb{N}}\frac{1}{m!}\sum_{j_1+\cdots+j_n=m}\frac{m!}{j_1!\cdots j_n!}\prod_{l=1}^{n}(T^{j_l}x)\right)\\
&= \sum_{m\in\mathbb{N}}\frac{1}{m!}\sum_{j_1+\cdots+j_{n+1}=m}\frac{m!}{j_1!\cdots j_{n+1}!}(T^{j_{n+1}}\varphi)\prod_{l=1}^{n}(T^{j_l}x)\\
&= e^T\cdot\varphi x^n
\end{aligned}
$$

must also exist in $R[[x,x^{-1}]][\varphi]$ for $a_n\neq 0$ and $b_n\neq 0$, respectively. Now note that equations (3.43) and (3.44) hold if we replace x by x^{-1}, and that these equations exist in $R[[x,x^{-1}]][\varphi]$ for $a_{-n}\neq 0$ and $b_{-n}\neq 0$, respectively. In this case (3.45) and (3.46) also exist in $R[[x,x^{-1}]][\varphi]$ if we replace x by x^{-1}, i.e., if $a_{-n}\neq 0$ then $e^T\cdot x^{-n}=(e^T\cdot x^{-1})^n$ exists in $R[[x,x^{-1}]][\varphi]$, and if $b_{-n}\neq 0$ then $e^T\cdot\varphi x^{-n}=(e^T\cdot\varphi)(e^T\cdot x^{-1})^n$ exists in $R[[x,x^{-1}]][\varphi]$.

But since $x^nx^{-n}=1$ and $e^T\cdot 1=1$, by the automorphism property Proposition 3.1, we have that $e^T\cdot x^{-1}=(e^T\cdot x)^{-1}$ which exists in $R[[x,x^{-1}]][\varphi]$, and thus $(e^T\cdot x)^{-n}$ and $(e^T\cdot\varphi)(e^T\cdot x)^{-n}$ exist in $R[[x,x^{-1}]][\varphi]$ for $a_{-n}\neq 0$ and $b_{-n}\neq 0$, respectively. Therefore

$$\overline{H}(e^T\cdot(x,\varphi))=\sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}}a_n(e^T\cdot x)^n+\sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}}b_n(e^T\cdot\varphi)(e^T\cdot x)^n$$

exists in $R[[x,x^{-1}]][\varphi]$.

In the case that $H(x,\varphi)=e^T\cdot(x,\varphi)$, $\overline{H}(x,\varphi)$ and $\overline{H}(e^T\cdot(x,\varphi))$ exist in $R[[x,x^{-1}]][\varphi]$, by reversing the steps of the argument above, we conclude that $e^T\cdot\overline{H}(x,\varphi)$ exists in $R[[x,x^{-1}]][\varphi]$. $\square$

3.3. The formal sewing equation and formal sewing identities

from the previous section, we see that in general the "formal infinitesimal superconformal transformations" are of the form

$$
\begin{aligned}
(3.47)\quad & \sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}\Big(B_jL_{-j}(x,\varphi)+N_{j-\frac{1}{2}}G_{-j+\frac{1}{2}}\Big)+(\log a_\square)2L_0(x,\varphi)\\
&\qquad\qquad +\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}\Big(A_jL_j(x,\varphi)+M_{j-\frac{1}{2}}G_{j-\frac{1}{2}}(x,\varphi)\Big)
\end{aligned}
$$

for $a_\square\in(R^0)^\times$, $A_j,B_j\in R^0$, and $M_{j-1/2},N_{j-1/2}\in R^1$. In this section, we will use these infinitesimal superconformal transformations to solve a formal version of the sewing equation along with the normalization and boundary conditions defined in Chapter 2. Recall that when one supersphere is being sewn with another at the i-th puncture of the first supersphere, the sewing equation is given by

$$F^{(1)}_\Delta(w,\rho)=F^{(2)}_\Delta\circ\hat{H}_0^{-1}\circ I\circ H_i(w,\rho)$$

where $\hat{H}_0$ is the local coordinate vanishing at ∞ of the second supersphere being sewn and H_i is the local coordinate vanishing at the i-th puncture, $(z_i,\theta_i)\in\bigwedge_\infty$, of the first supersphere being sewn. Thus formally we can write H_i and $\hat{H}_0$ in terms of exponentials of infinitesimal superconformal transformations and then try to solve for formal versions of $F^{(1)}_\Delta$ and $F^{(2)}_\Delta$. To do this formally and algebraically without having to address issues of convergence, we will use additional formal variables such that certain formal infinite sums are well defined. The geometric interpretation of this formal algebraic solution and questions of convergence will be addressed in Chapter 4.

Let $\mathcal{A} = \{\mathcal{A}_j\}_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}$ and $\mathcal{B} = \{\mathcal{B}_j\}_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}$ be two sequences of even formal variables, and let $\alpha_0^{1/2}$ be another even formal variable. Let $\mathcal{M} = \{\mathcal{M}_{j-1/2}\}_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}$ and $\mathcal{N} = \{\mathcal{N}_{j-1/2}\}_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}$ be two sequences of odd formal variables. Take the algebra R of Section 3.2 to be

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathbb{C}[\alpha_0^{\frac{1}{2}}, \alpha_0^{-\frac{1}{2}}][[\mathcal{A},\mathcal{B}]][\mathcal{M},\mathcal{N}]\\ &\qquad = \mathbb{C}[\alpha_0^{\frac{1}{2}}, \alpha_0^{-\frac{1}{2}}][[\mathcal{A}_1,\mathcal{A}_2,...,\mathcal{B}_1,\mathcal{B}_2,...]][\mathcal{M}_{\frac{1}{2}},\mathcal{M}_{\frac{3}{2}},...,\mathcal{N}_{\frac{1}{2}},\mathcal{N}_{\frac{3}{2}},...].\end{aligned}$$

Let

$$\begin{aligned}(3.48)\quad &H^{(1)}_{\alpha_0^{1/2},\mathcal{A},\mathcal{M}}(x,\varphi)\\ &= \exp\Biggl(-\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}\Bigl(\mathcal{A}_jL_j(x,\varphi) + \mathcal{M}_{j-\frac{1}{2}}G_{j-\frac{1}{2}}(x,\varphi)\Bigr)\Biggr)\cdot(\alpha_0^{\frac{1}{2}})^{-2L_0(x,\varphi)}\cdot(x,\varphi),\end{aligned}$$

$$(3.49)\quad H^{(2)}_{\mathcal{B},\mathcal{N}}(x,\varphi) = \exp\Biggl(\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}\Bigl(\mathcal{B}_jL_{-j}(x,\varphi) + \mathcal{N}_{j-\frac{1}{2}}G_{-j+\frac{1}{2}}(x,\varphi)\Bigr)\Biggr)\cdot\Bigl(\frac{1}{x},\frac{i\varphi}{x}\Bigr).$$

The formal power series $H^{(2)}_{\mathcal{B},\mathcal{N}}(x,\varphi) \in x^{-1}R[[x^{-1}]][\varphi]$ is superconformal of the form (3.38). By Proposition 3.17, its compositional inverse $(H^{(2)}_{\mathcal{B},\mathcal{N}})^{-1}(x,\varphi)$ is a well-defined element of $x^{-1}R[[x]][\varphi]$, and by (3.39) we have

$$\begin{aligned}(3.50)\quad &(H^{(2)}_{\mathcal{B},\mathcal{N}})^{-1}\Bigl(\frac{1}{x},\frac{i\varphi}{x}\Bigr)\\ &\qquad = \exp\Biggl(-\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}\Bigl(\mathcal{B}_jL_{-j}(x,\varphi) + \mathcal{N}_{j-\frac{1}{2}}G_{-j+\frac{1}{2}}(x,\varphi)\Bigr)\Biggr)\cdot(x,\varphi).\end{aligned}$$

PROPOSITION 3.22. *In $R[[x,x^{-1}]][\varphi]$, we have*

$$\begin{aligned}(3.51)\quad &(H^{(2)}_{\mathcal{B},\mathcal{N}})^{-1}\circ I\circ H^{(1)}_{\alpha_0^{1/2},\mathcal{A},\mathcal{M}}(x,\varphi)\\ &= \exp\Biggl(-\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}\Bigl(\mathcal{A}_jL_j(x,\varphi) + \mathcal{M}_{j-\frac{1}{2}}G_{j-\frac{1}{2}}(x,\varphi)\Bigr)\Biggr)\cdot(\alpha_0^{\frac{1}{2}})^{-2L_0(x,\varphi)}\cdot\\ &\qquad \exp\Biggl(-\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}\Bigl(\mathcal{B}_jL_{-j}(x,\varphi) + \mathcal{N}_{j-\frac{1}{2}}G_{-j+\frac{1}{2}}(x,\varphi)\Bigr)\Biggr)\cdot(x,\varphi)\end{aligned}$$

where we always expand formal series in nonnegative powers of $\mathcal{A}_j, \mathcal{B}_j, \mathcal{M}_{j-1/2}$, and $\mathcal{N}_{j-1/2}$, for $j \in \mathbb{Z}_+$.

Proof. Let

$$\begin{aligned}&(H^{(2)}_{\mathcal{B},\mathcal{N}})^{-1}\circ I(x,\varphi)\\&\quad=(x,\varphi)+\sum_{\substack{n,\,l\in\mathbb{N}\\(n,l)\neq(0,0)}}\ \sum_{\substack{j_1>\ldots>j_n>0\\k_1>\ldots>k_l>0}}\ \sum_{m_1,\ldots,m_n\in\mathbb{Z}_+}H^{j_1,\ldots,j_n;k_1,\ldots,k_l}_{m_1,\ldots,m_n}(x,\varphi)\cdot\\&\qquad\qquad\cdot\mathcal{B}^{m_1}_{j_1}\cdots\mathcal{B}^{m_n}_{j_n}i\mathcal{N}_{k_1-\frac{1}{2}}\cdots i\mathcal{N}_{k_l-\frac{1}{2}}.\end{aligned}$$

from (3.50), we see that $H^{j_1,\ldots,j_n;k_1,\ldots,k_l}_{m_1,\ldots,m_n}(x,\varphi)\in\mathbb{Q}((x))[\varphi]$. Then by Proposition 3.12, we have

$$\begin{aligned}&H^{j_1,\ldots,j_n;k_1,\ldots,k_l}_{m_1,\ldots,m_n}(H^{(1)}_{\alpha_0^{1/2},\mathcal{A},\mathcal{M}}(x,\varphi))\\&\quad=\exp\left(-\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}\Big(\mathcal{A}_jL_j(x,\varphi)+\mathcal{M}_{j-\frac{1}{2}}G_{j-\frac{1}{2}}(x,\varphi)\Big)\right)\cdot(\alpha_0^{\frac{1}{2}})^{-2L_0(x,\varphi)}\cdot\\&\qquad\qquad\cdot H^{j_1,\ldots,j_n;k_1,\ldots,k_l}_{m_1,\ldots,m_n}(x,\varphi).\end{aligned}$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned}&(H^{(2)}_{\mathcal{B},\mathcal{N}})^{-1}\circ I\circ H^{(1)}_{\alpha_0^{1/2},\mathcal{A},\mathcal{M}}(x,\varphi)\\&\quad=\exp\left(-\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}\Big(\mathcal{A}_jL_j(x,\varphi)+\mathcal{M}_{j-\frac{1}{2}}G_{j-\frac{1}{2}}(x,\varphi)\Big)\right)\cdot(\alpha_0^{\frac{1}{2}})^{-2L_0(x,\varphi)}\cdot\\&\qquad\qquad\cdot(H^{(2)}_{\mathcal{B},\mathcal{N}})^{-1}\circ I(x,\varphi).\end{aligned}$$

Using (3.50), we obtain (3.51). □

Remark 3.23. From Proposition 3.22, we see that the composition

$$(H^{(2)}_{\mathcal{B},\mathcal{N}})^{-1}\circ I\circ H^{(1)}_{\alpha_0^{1/2},\mathcal{A},\mathcal{M}}(x,\varphi)$$

is generated by the formal infinitesimal superconformal transformations given by (3.47). As shown in Chapter 2, geometrically this composition is the formal superconformal transition function of the sewn neighborhoods of a supersphere with tubes sewn from two canonical superspheres with tubes (see equation (2.47)). This is why we construct the formal superconformal transformations from the formal infinitesimal superconformal transformations in this way. Of course, in the formal version of the superconformal transition function (3.51), we have assumed that the puncture on the first supersphere into which the second supersphere is being sewn is at zero. In general this will be at some point $p\in U_\Delta$ corresponding to $(z_i,\theta_i)=\Delta(p)$. Of course this discrepancy can be rectified by appropriately incorporating the superconformal shift $s_{(z_i,\theta_i)}(x,\varphi)=(x-z_i-\varphi\theta_i,\varphi-\theta_i)$.

Remark 3.24. Note the symmetry in the operators acting on (x,φ) on the right-hand side of equation (3.51). Replacing (x,φ), $(\mathcal{A},\mathcal{M})$, and $(\mathcal{B},\mathcal{N})$ with $I(x,\varphi)=(x^{-1},i\varphi x^{-1})$, $(\mathcal{B},-i\mathcal{N})$, and $(\mathcal{A},-i\mathcal{M})$, respectively, for this operator, we obtain its inverse. If we had not factored out $a_\square$ as we did (see Remark 2.18), this symmetry would be broken.

PROPOSITION 3.25. *For $H(x,\varphi) \in R[x,x^{-1},\varphi]$, we have*

$$H\Bigg(\exp\Bigg(-\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}\Big(\mathcal{A}_j L_j(x,\varphi) + \mathcal{M}_{j-\frac{1}{2}} G_{j-\frac{1}{2}}(x,\varphi)\Big)\Bigg)\cdot (\alpha_0^{\frac{1}{2}})^{-2L_0(x,\varphi)} \cdot \exp\Bigg(-\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}\Big(\mathcal{B}_j L_{-j}(x,\varphi) + \mathcal{N}_{j-\frac{1}{2}} G_{-j+\frac{1}{2}}(x,\varphi)\Big)\Bigg)\cdot (x,\varphi)\Bigg)$$

$$= \exp\Bigg(-\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}\Big(\mathcal{A}_j L_j(x,\varphi) + \mathcal{M}_{j-\frac{1}{2}} G_{j-\frac{1}{2}}(x,\varphi)\Big)\Bigg)\cdot (\alpha_0^{\frac{1}{2}})^{-2L_0(x,\varphi)} \cdot \exp\Bigg(-\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}\Big(\mathcal{B}_j L_{-j}(x,\varphi) + \mathcal{N}_{j-\frac{1}{2}} G_{-j+\frac{1}{2}}(x,\varphi)\Big)\Bigg)\cdot H(x,\varphi)$$

PROOF. The result follows from Propositions 3.12 and 3.20. $\square$

For the theorem below, it will be convenient to fix the following notation. Let

$$g_{\mathcal{A}} = \sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+} \mathcal{A}_j x^{j+1}, \qquad g_{\mathcal{M}} = \sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+} \mathcal{M}_{j-\frac{1}{2}} x^{j},$$
$$g_{\mathcal{B}} = \sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+} \mathcal{B}_j x^{-j+1}, \qquad g_{\mathcal{N}} = \sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+} \mathcal{N}_{j-\frac{1}{2}} x^{-j+1}.$$

Let $(\mathbf{0},\mathbf{0}) = \mathbf{0} \in R^\infty$ be the sequence consisting of all zeros. Let $\tilde{R}$ be any superalgebra. For $p(x) \in \tilde{R}[[x,x^{-1}]]$, we let $(p(x))^-$ and $(p(x))^+$ be the unique series such that $(p(x))^- \in \tilde{R}[[x^{-1}]]$, $(p(x))^+ \in x\tilde{R}[[x]]$, and

$$p(x) = (p(x))^- + (p(x))^+.$$

THEOREM 3.26. *There exist formal series*

$$\bar{F}^{(1)} \in x\mathbb{C}[\alpha_0^{\frac{1}{2}}, \alpha_0^{-\frac{1}{2}}][x^{-1},\varphi][[\mathcal{A},\mathcal{B}]][\mathcal{M},\mathcal{N}]$$

and

$$\bar{F}^{(2)} \in x\mathbb{C}[\alpha_0^{\frac{1}{2}}, \alpha_0^{-\frac{1}{2}}][x,\varphi][[\mathcal{A},\mathcal{B}]][\mathcal{M},\mathcal{N}]$$

which are superconformal in (x, φ) *satisfying the "formal boundary conditions"*

$$\begin{aligned}
(3.52)\quad \bar{F}^{(1)}(x,\varphi)\Big|_{(\mathcal{A},\mathcal{M})=\mathbf{0}} &= (\alpha_0^{\frac{1}{2}})^{2L_0(x,\varphi)} \cdot \exp\bigg(-\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+} (\mathcal{B}_j L_{-j}(x,\varphi) \\
&\qquad + \mathcal{N}_{j-\frac{1}{2}} G_{-j+\frac{1}{2}}(x,\varphi))\bigg) \cdot (\alpha_0^{\frac{1}{2}})^{-2L_0(x,\varphi)} \cdot (x,\varphi)
\end{aligned}$$

$$(3.53)\quad \bar{F}^{(1)}(x,\varphi)\Big|_{(\mathcal{B},\mathcal{N})=\mathbf{0}} = (x,\varphi)$$

$$(3.54)\quad \bar{F}^{(2)}(x,\varphi)\Big|_{(\mathcal{A},\mathcal{M})=\mathbf{0}} = (\alpha_0^{-1}x, \alpha_0^{-\frac{1}{2}}\varphi)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
(3.55)\quad \bar{F}^{(2)}(x,\varphi)\Big|_{(\mathcal{B},\mathcal{N})=\mathbf{0}} &= (\alpha_0^{\frac{1}{2}})^{2L_0(x,\varphi)} \cdot \exp\bigg(\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+} (\mathcal{A}_j L_j(x,\varphi) \\
&\qquad + \mathcal{M}_{j-\frac{1}{2}} G_{j-\frac{1}{2}}(x,\varphi))\bigg) \cdot (x,\varphi),
\end{aligned}$$

and the conditions

$$\begin{aligned}
(3.56)\quad \varphi\bar{F}^{(1)}(x,\varphi) = \varphi\ \bar{F}^{(1)}(x,\varphi)\Big|_{(\mathcal{A},\mathcal{M})=\mathbf{0}} &+ \varphi\bigg(\Big(\alpha_0^{-1} g_{\mathcal{A}}(x)\frac{\partial}{\partial x} g_{\mathcal{B}}(\alpha_0 x) \\
&- \alpha_0^{-1} g_{\mathcal{B}}(\alpha_0 x)\frac{\partial}{\partial x} g_{\mathcal{A}}(x)\Big)^- + 2\alpha_0^{-\frac{1}{2}}\left(g_{\mathcal{M}}(x) g_{\mathcal{N}}(\alpha_0 x)\right)^-, \\
&\alpha_0^{-\frac{1}{2}}\Big(g_{\mathcal{A}}(x)\frac{\partial}{\partial x} g_{\mathcal{N}}(\alpha_0 x) - \frac{1}{2} g_{\mathcal{N}}(\alpha_0 x)\frac{\partial}{\partial x} g_{\mathcal{A}}(x)\Big)^- \\
&+\ \alpha_0^{-1}\Big(\frac{1}{2} g_{\mathcal{M}}(x)\frac{\partial}{\partial x} g_{\mathcal{B}}(\alpha_0 x) - g_{\mathcal{B}}(\alpha_0 x)\frac{\partial}{\partial x} g_{\mathcal{M}}(x)\Big)^-\bigg) + \varphi R^{(1)}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
(3.57)\quad \varphi\bar{F}^{(2)}(x,\varphi) = \varphi\ \bar{F}^{(2)}(x,\varphi)\Big|_{(\mathcal{B},\mathcal{N})=\mathbf{0}} &+ \varphi\bigg(\Big(g_{\mathcal{B}}(x)\frac{\partial}{\partial x} g_{\mathcal{A}}(\alpha_0^{-1} x) \\
&- g_{\mathcal{A}}(\alpha_0^{-1} x)\frac{\partial}{\partial x} g_{\mathcal{B}}(x)\Big)^+ - 2\alpha_0^{-\frac{1}{2}}\left(g_{\mathcal{M}}(x) g_{\mathcal{N}}(\alpha_0 x)\right)^+, \\
&+\ \alpha_0^{\frac{1}{2}}\Big(\frac{1}{2} g_{\mathcal{N}}(x)\frac{\partial}{\partial x} g_{\mathcal{A}}(\alpha_0^{-1} x) - g_{\mathcal{A}}(\alpha_0^{-1} x)\frac{\partial}{\partial x} g_{\mathcal{N}}(x)\Big)^+ \\
&+\Big(g_{\mathcal{B}}(x)\frac{\partial}{\partial x} g_{\mathcal{M}}(\alpha_0^{-1} x) - \frac{1}{2} g_{\mathcal{M}}(\alpha_0^{-1} x)\frac{\partial}{\partial x} g_{\mathcal{B}}(x)\Big)^+\bigg) + \varphi R^{(2)}
\end{aligned}$$

where $R^{(1)}$ *and* $R^{(2)}$ *are elements in*

$$\mathbb{C}[\alpha_0^{\frac{1}{2}}, \alpha_0^{-\frac{1}{2}}][[\mathcal{A},\mathcal{B}]][\mathcal{M},\mathcal{N}][[x^{-1}]]$$

and

$$\mathbb{C}[\alpha_0^{\frac{1}{2}}, \alpha_0^{-\frac{1}{2}}][[\mathcal{A},\mathcal{B}]][\mathcal{M},\mathcal{N}][[x]],$$

respectively, containing only terms with the total degree in the $\mathcal{A}_j$*'s and* $\mathcal{M}_{j-1/2}$*'s at least one, total degree in the* $\mathcal{B}_j$*'s and* $\mathcal{N}_{j-1/2}$*'s at least one, and total degree in the* $\mathcal{A}_j$*'s,* $\mathcal{M}_{j-1/2}$*'s,* $\mathcal{B}_j$*'s and* $\mathcal{N}_{j-1/2}$*'s at least three.*

Then $\bar{F}^{(2)} \circ (H^{(2)}_{\mathcal{B},\mathcal{N}})^{-1} \circ I \circ H^{(1)}_{\alpha_0^{1/2},\mathcal{A},\mathcal{M}}(x,\varphi)$ *exists in*

$$x\mathbb{C}[\alpha_0^{\frac{1}{2}}, \alpha_0^{-\frac{1}{2}}][x^{-1},\varphi][[\mathcal{A},\mathcal{B}]][\mathcal{M},\mathcal{N}],$$

and there exist unique $\bar{F}^{(1)}$ *and* $\bar{F}^{(2)}$ *satisfying the above such that*

$$\bar{F}^{(1)}(x,\varphi) = \bar{F}^{(2)} \circ (H^{(2)}_{\mathcal{B},\mathcal{N}})^{-1} \circ I \circ H^{(1)}_{\alpha_0^{1/2},\mathcal{A},\mathcal{M}}(x,\varphi). \tag{3.58}$$

We call equation (3.58) the "formal sewing equation". [2]

Proof. Write

$$\varphi\bar{F}^{(1)}(x,\varphi) = \varphi\Big(x + \sum_{m,s,n,t\in\mathbb{N}} h^0_{msnt}(x), \sum_{m,s,n,t\in\mathbb{N}} h^1_{msnt}(x)\Big) \tag{3.59}$$

$$\varphi\bar{F}^{(2)}(x,\varphi) = \varphi\Big(\alpha_0^{-1}x + \sum_{m,s,n,t\in\mathbb{N}} k^0_{msnt}(x), \sum_{m,s,n,t\in\mathbb{N}} k^1_{msnt}(x)\Big) \tag{3.60}$$

where $\bar{F}^{(2)}$ is superconformal, and

$$\begin{array}{rcccl} (h^0_{msnt}(x), h^1_{msnt}(x)) & = & h_{msnt}(x) & \in & \mathbb{C}[\alpha_0^{\frac{1}{2}}, \alpha_0^{-\frac{1}{2}}][[\mathcal{A},\mathcal{B}]][\mathcal{M},\mathcal{N}][[x^{-1}]] \\ (k^0_{msnt}(x), k^1_{msnt}(x)) & = & k_{msnt}(x) & \in & x\mathbb{C}[\alpha_0^{\frac{1}{2}}, \alpha_0^{-\frac{1}{2}}][[\mathcal{A},\mathcal{B}]][\mathcal{M},\mathcal{N}][[x]], \end{array}$$

are both homogeneous of degree m in the $\mathcal{A}_j$'s, degree s in the $\mathcal{M}_{j-1/2}$'s, degree n in the $\mathcal{B}_j$'s, and degree t in the $\mathcal{N}_{j-1/2}$'s, for $j \in \mathbb{Z}_+$. The fact that $\bar{F}^{(2)}$ is superconformal implies that

$$\begin{aligned} &\bar{F}^{(2)}(x,\varphi) = (\tilde{x},\tilde{\varphi}) \\ &\quad = \Bigg(\alpha_0^{-1}x + \sum_{m,s,n,t\in\mathbb{N}} \big(k^0_{msnt}(x) + \varphi q^1_{msnt}(x)\big), \sum_{m,s,n,t\in\mathbb{N}} \big(k^1_{msnt}(x) + \varphi q^0_{msnt}(x)\big)\Bigg) \end{aligned}$$

where each $q_{msnt} = (q^0_{msnt}, q^1_{msnt})$ is homogeneous of degree m in the $\mathcal{A}_j$'s, degree s in the $\mathcal{M}_{j-1/2}$'s, degree n in the $\mathcal{B}_j$'s, and degree t in the $\mathcal{N}_{j-1/2}$'s, for $j \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, and where $\bar{F}^{(2)}(x,\varphi) = (\tilde{x},\tilde{\varphi})$ satisfies $D\tilde{x} = \tilde{\varphi}D\tilde{\varphi}$ for $D = \frac{\partial}{\partial\varphi} + \varphi\frac{\partial}{\partial x}$. (Of course $h_{msnt} = h^0_{msnt}$ for $s+t$ even, $h_{msnt} = h^1_{msnt}$ for $s+t$ odd, and similarly for k_{msnt} and q_{msnt}.)

---

[2] There is a misprint in the formulas (2.2.11) and (2.2.12) of Theorem 2.2.4 in [**H2**] giving the analogous nonsuper case to our Theorem 3.26. The first two terms in the right-hand side of (2.2.11) should be replaced by $\alpha_0^{-1}(f^{(2)}_{\mathcal{B}})^{-1}(\frac{1}{\alpha_0 x})$ and the first two terms in the right-hand side of (2.2.12) should be replaced by $(f^{(1)}_{\mathcal{A},\alpha_0})^{-1}(x)$. Similar misprints occurred in [**H1**] and [**B1**]. These misprints were first corrected in [**BHL**].

Thus letting $(H^{(2)}_{\mathcal{B},\mathcal{N}})^{-1} \circ I \circ H^{(1)}_{\alpha_0^{1/2},\mathcal{A},\mathcal{M}}(x,\varphi) = (H^0(x,\varphi), H^1(x,\varphi))$, equation (3.58) gives

$$
\begin{aligned}
(3.61)\quad & \varphi\Bigg(x + \sum_{m,s,n,t\in\mathbb{N}} h^0_{msnt}(x), \sum_{m,s,n,t\in\mathbb{N}} h^1_{msnt}(x)\Bigg)\\
&= \varphi\Bigg(\alpha_0^{-1}H^0(x,\varphi) + \sum_{m,s,n,t\in\mathbb{N}} \Big(k^0_{msnt}(H^0(x,\varphi)) + H^1(x,\varphi)q^1_{msnt}(H^0(x,\varphi))\Big),\\
&\qquad\qquad \sum_{m,s,n,t\in\mathbb{N}} \Big(k^1_{msnt}(H^0(x,\varphi)) + H^1(x,\varphi)q^0_{msnt}(H^0(x,\varphi))\Big)\Bigg).
\end{aligned}
$$

from the boundary conditions (3.52) - (3.55), we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\varphi\Bigg(x + \sum_{n,t\in\mathbb{N}} h^0_{00nt}(x), \sum_{n,t\in\mathbb{N}} h^1_{00nt}(x)\Bigg)\\
&\quad = \varphi\Bigg(\alpha_0^{-1}\Big((H^{(2)}_{\mathcal{B},\mathcal{N}})^{-1}\circ I(\alpha_0 x, \alpha_0^{\frac{1}{2}}\varphi)\Big)^0, \alpha_0^{-\frac{1}{2}}\Big((H^{(2)}_{\mathcal{B},\mathcal{N}})^{-1}\circ I(\alpha_0 x, \alpha_0^{\frac{1}{2}}\varphi)\Big)^1\Bigg)\\
&\quad = \varphi(\alpha_0^{\frac{1}{2}})^{2L_0(x,\varphi)}\cdot \exp\Bigg(-\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}\Big(\mathcal{B}_j L_{-j}(x,\varphi) + \mathcal{N}_{j-\frac{1}{2}} G_{-j+\frac{1}{2}}(x,\varphi)\Big)\Bigg)\cdot\\
&\qquad\qquad\qquad \cdot(\alpha_0^{\frac{1}{2}})^{-2L_0(x,\varphi)}\cdot(x,\varphi),
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
\varphi\Bigg(x + \sum_{m,s\in\mathbb{N}} h^0_{ms00}(x), \sum_{m,s\in\mathbb{N}} h^1_{ms00}(x)\Bigg) &= \varphi(x,0),\\
\varphi\Bigg(\alpha_0^{-1}x + \sum_{n,t\in\mathbb{N}} k^0_{00nt}(x), \sum_{n,t\in\mathbb{N}} k^1_{00nt}(x)\Bigg) &= \varphi(\alpha_0^{-1}x,0),\\
\varphi\Bigg(\alpha_0^{-1}x + \sum_{m,s\in\mathbb{N}} k^0_{ms00}(x), \sum_{m,s\in\mathbb{N}} k^1_{ms00}(x)\Bigg) &= \varphi(H^{(1)}_{\alpha_0^{1/2},\mathcal{A},\mathcal{M}})^{-1}(x,\varphi)\\
= \varphi(\alpha_0^{\frac{1}{2}})^{2L_0(x,\varphi)}\cdot\exp\Bigg(\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}\Big(\mathcal{A}_j L_j(x,\varphi) &+ \mathcal{M}_{j-\frac{1}{2}} G_{j-\frac{1}{2}}(x,\varphi)\Big)\Bigg)\cdot(x,\varphi).
\end{aligned}
$$

These equations give $h_{ms00}, h_{00nt}, k_{ms00}$, and k_{00nt} uniquely for all $m,s,n,t\in\mathbb{N}$.

By the superconformal condition $D\tilde{x} = \tilde{\varphi}D\tilde{\varphi}$ for $\bar{F}^{(2)}(x,\varphi) = (\tilde{x},\tilde{\varphi})$ and the boundary conditions, we see that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\sum_{m,s,n,t\in\mathbb{N}} q^0_{msnt}(x) &= \alpha_0^{-\frac{1}{2}}\Bigg(1 + \alpha_0\Bigg(\sum_{m,s,n,t\in\mathbb{N}} k^0_{msnt}(x)\Bigg)'\\
&\qquad + \alpha_0\Bigg(\sum_{m,s,n,t\in\mathbb{N}} k^1_{msnt}(x)\Bigg)\Bigg(\sum_{m,s,n,t\in\mathbb{N}} k^1_{msnt}(x)\Bigg)'\Bigg)^{1/2}\\
\sum_{m,s,n,t\in\mathbb{N}} q^1_{msnt}(x) &= \alpha_0^{-\frac{1}{2}}\Bigg(\sum_{m,s,n,t\in\mathbb{N}} k^1_{msnt}(x)\Bigg)\Bigg(1 + \alpha_0\Bigg(\sum_{m,s,n,t\in\mathbb{N}} k^0_{msnt}(x)\Bigg)'\Bigg)^{1/2}
\end{aligned}
$$

where the square root is defined to be the Taylor series expansion about $x = 0$ and $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{M} = \mathcal{B} = \mathcal{N} = \mathbf{0}$ with $\sqrt{1} = 1$. Note that each q_{msnt} is determined by k_{ijlp} for $0 \leq i \leq m$, $0 \leq j \leq s$, $0 \leq l \leq n$, and $0 \leq p \leq t$. Thus the $h_{ms00}, h_{00nt}, k_{ms00}$, and k_{00nt} that we have determined from the boundary conditions for all $m, s, n, t \in \mathbb{N}$, uniquely determine q_{ms00} and q_{00nt} for all $m, s, n, t \in \mathbb{N}$. from (3.61), it is clear that the h_{msnt} term on the right-hand side only depends on H^0, H^1, and $k_{ijlp}(H^0(x, \varphi))$ for $0 \leq i \leq m$, $0 \leq j \leq s$, $0 \leq l \leq n$, and $0 \leq p \leq t$.

Note that for all k_{ms00}, k_{00nt}, q_{ms00}, and q_{00nt} the coefficient of a given term $\mathcal{A}_{j_1} \cdots \mathcal{A}_{j_m} \mathcal{M}_{i_1 - 1/2} \cdots \mathcal{M}_{i_s - 1/2}$ or $\mathcal{B}_{j_1} \cdots \mathcal{B}_{j_n} \mathcal{N}_{i_1 - 1/2} \cdots \mathcal{N}_{i_t - 1/2}$ is in $\mathbb{C}[x]$, i.e.,

$$k_{ms00}, k_{00nt}, q_{ms00}, q_{00nt} \in \mathbb{C}[\alpha_0^{\frac{1}{2}}, \alpha_0^{-\frac{1}{2}}][x][[\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}]][\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N}].$$

Thus by Propositions 3.22 and 3.25, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&k_{ms00}(H^0(x, \varphi)) \\
&\quad = \sum_{\substack{j_1 \leq \ldots \leq j_m \\ i_1 < \ldots < i_s}} p^{j_1 \ldots j_m}_{i_1 \ldots i_s}(H^0(x, \varphi)) \mathcal{A}_{j_1} \cdots \mathcal{A}_{j_m} \mathcal{M}_{i_1 - \frac{1}{2}} \cdots \mathcal{M}_{i_s - \frac{1}{2}} \\
&\quad = \sum_{\substack{j_1 \leq \ldots \leq j_m \\ i_1 < \ldots < i_s}} p^{j_1 \ldots j_m}_{i_1 \ldots i_s} \Bigg(\exp\Bigg(- \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}_+} \Big(\mathcal{A}_j L_j(x, \varphi) + \mathcal{M}_{j - \frac{1}{2}} G_{j - \frac{1}{2}}(x, \varphi) \Big) \Bigg) \cdot \\
&\qquad (\alpha_0^{\frac{1}{2}})^{-2L_0(x, \varphi)} \cdot \exp\Bigg(- \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}_+} \Big(\mathcal{B}_j L_{-j}(x, \varphi) + \mathcal{N}_{j - \frac{1}{2}} G_{-j + \frac{1}{2}}(x, \varphi) \Big) \Bigg) \cdot x \Bigg) \\
&\qquad\qquad \mathcal{A}_{j_1} \cdots \mathcal{A}_{j_m} \mathcal{M}_{i_1 - \frac{1}{2}} \cdots \mathcal{M}_{i_s - \frac{1}{2}} \\
&\quad = \sum_{\substack{j_1 \leq \ldots \leq j_m \\ i_1 < \ldots < i_s}} \exp\Bigg(- \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}_+} \Big(\mathcal{A}_j L_j(x, \varphi) + \mathcal{M}_{j - \frac{1}{2}} G_{j - \frac{1}{2}}(x, \varphi) \Big) \Bigg) \cdot (\alpha_0^{\frac{1}{2}})^{-2L_0(x, \varphi)} \cdot \\
&\qquad\qquad \exp\Bigg(- \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}_+} \Big(\mathcal{B}_j L_{-j}(x, \varphi) + \mathcal{N}_{j - \frac{1}{2}} G_{-j + \frac{1}{2}}(x, \varphi) \Big) \Bigg) \cdot p^{j_1 \ldots j_m}_{i_1 \ldots i_s}(x) \\
&\quad = \sum_{\substack{j_1 \leq \ldots \leq j_m \\ i_1 < \ldots < i_s}} \exp\Bigg(- \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}_+} \Big(\mathcal{A}_j L_j(x, \varphi) + \mathcal{M}_{j - \frac{1}{2}} G_{j - \frac{1}{2}}(x, \varphi) \Big) \Bigg) \cdot (\alpha_0^{\frac{1}{2}})^{-2L_0(x, \varphi)} \cdot \\
&\qquad\qquad \exp\Bigg(- \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}_+} \Big(\mathcal{B}_j L_{-j}(x, \varphi) + \mathcal{N}_{j - \frac{1}{2}} G_{-j + \frac{1}{2}}(x, \varphi) \Big) \Bigg) \cdot k_{ms00}(x).
\end{aligned}$$

And similarly for k_{00nt}, q_{ms00}, q_{00nt}, and in fact for any

$$p(x) \in \mathbb{C}[\alpha_0^{\frac{1}{2}}, \alpha_0^{-\frac{1}{2}}][x][[\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}]][\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N}].$$

Now we can solve equation (3.61) for $h_{msnt}(x)$ and $k_{msnt}(x)$ by induction on m, s, n, and t. In fact, if we compare terms which are homogeneous of degree m in the $\mathcal{A}_j$'s, degree s in the $\mathcal{M}_{j-1/2}$'s, degree n in the $\mathcal{B}_j$'s, and degree t in the $\mathcal{N}_{j-1/2}$'s, for $j \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, on both sides of (3.61), we have

$$h_{msnt}(x) = k_{msnt}(\alpha_0 x) + \tilde{k}^{(msnt)}(x) + \tilde{q}^{(msnt)}(x) \tag{3.62}$$

where $\tilde{k}^{(msnt)}(x)$ and $\tilde{q}^{(msnt)}(x)$ are homogeneous of degree m in the $\mathcal{A}_j$'s, degree s in the $\mathcal{M}_{j-1/2}$'s, degree n in the $\mathcal{B}_j$'s, and degree t in the $\mathcal{N}_{j-1/2}$'s, for $j \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, and depend only on h_{ijlp} and k_{ijlp} for $0 \leq i \leq m$, $0 \leq j \leq s$, $0 \leq l \leq n$, and $0 \leq p \leq t$, where $(i,j,l,p) \neq (m,s,n,t)$. Assume h_{ijlp} and k_{ijlp} (and thus q_{ijlp}) have already been obtained for $0 \leq i \leq m$, $0 \leq j \leq s$, $0 \leq l \leq n$, and $0 \leq p \leq t$, where $(i,j,l,p) \neq (m,s,n,t)$, and assume that we have shown that each k_{ijlp} and q_{ijlp} is in $\mathbb{C}[\alpha_0^{\frac{1}{2}}, \alpha_0^{-\frac{1}{2}}][x][[\mathcal{A},\mathcal{B}]][\mathcal{M},\mathcal{N}]$. Then by using Proposition 3.25 on each polynomial coefficient of each k_{ijlp} (as we did for $k_{ms00}(x)$), we can determine $\tilde{k}^{(msnt)}(x)$ and $\tilde{q}^{(msnt)}(x)$. Then from (3.62), we have

$$h_{msnt}(x) = (\tilde{k}^{(msnt)}(x))^- + (\tilde{q}^{(msnt)}(x))^-$$

$$k_{msnt}(\alpha_0 x) = -(\tilde{k}^{(msnt)}(x))^+ - (\tilde{q}^{(msnt)}(x))^+$$

where

$$(\tilde{k}^{(msnt)}(x))^-, (\tilde{q}^{(msnt)}(x))^- \in \mathbb{C}[\alpha_0^{\frac{1}{2}}, \alpha_0^{-\frac{1}{2}}][[\mathcal{A},\mathcal{B}]][\mathcal{M},\mathcal{N}][[x^{-1}]]$$

and

$$(\tilde{k}^{(msnt)}(x))^+, (\tilde{q}^{(msnt)}(x))^+ \in \mathbb{C}[\alpha_0^{\frac{1}{2}}, \alpha_0^{-\frac{1}{2}}][[\mathcal{A},\mathcal{B}]][\mathcal{M},\mathcal{N}][[x]]$$

such that

$$(\tilde{k}^{(msnt)}(x))^- + (\tilde{k}^{(msnt)}(x))^+ = \tilde{k}^{(msnt)}(x),$$

and

$$(\tilde{q}^{(msnt)}(x))^- + (\tilde{q}^{(msnt)}(x))^+ = \tilde{q}^{(msnt)}(x).$$

By the principle of induction, we obtain $h_{msnt}(x)$ and $k_{msnt}(\alpha_0 x)$ for all $m,s,n,t \in \mathbb{N}$, and thus we obtain $\varphi\bar{F}^{(1)}(x,\varphi)$ and $\varphi\bar{F}^{(2)}(x,\varphi)$. It is clear from the procedure to solve (3.61) that the solutions $\varphi\bar{F}^{(1)}(x,\varphi)$ and $\varphi\bar{F}^{(2)}(x,\varphi)$ are unique. Furthermore note that the even coefficient of φ in $\bar{F}^{(1)}(x,\varphi)$ is one and the even coefficient of φ in $\bar{F}^{(2)}(x,\varphi)\big|_{(\mathcal{A},\mathcal{M})=\mathbf{0}}$ is $\alpha_0^{-1/2}$. Let $\bar{F}^{(1)}(x,\varphi)$ and $\bar{F}^{(2)}(x,\varphi)$ be the unique formal superconformal series satisfying $\varphi\bar{F}^{(1)}(x,\varphi)$ and $\varphi\bar{F}^{(2)}(x,\varphi)$ such that the even coefficient of φ in $\bar{F}^{(1)}(x,\varphi)$ is one and the even coefficient of φ in $\bar{F}^{(2)}(x,\varphi)\big|_{(\mathcal{A},\mathcal{M})=\mathbf{0}}$ is $\alpha_0^{-1/2}$.

To complete the proof, we note that

$$\begin{aligned} h_{1010}(x) &= k_{1010}(\alpha_0 x) + \alpha_0^{-1} g_{\mathcal{B}}(\alpha_0 x)\frac{\partial}{\partial x}k_{1000}(\alpha_0 x) + g_{\mathcal{A}}(x)\frac{\partial}{\partial x}k_{0010}(\alpha_0 x) \\ &\qquad + \alpha_0^{-1} g_{\mathcal{A}}(x)\frac{\partial}{\partial x}g_{\mathcal{B}}(\alpha_0 x) \\ &= k_{1010}(\alpha_0 x) - \alpha_0^{-1} g_{\mathcal{B}}(\alpha_0 x)\frac{\partial}{\partial x}g_{\mathcal{A}}(x) + \alpha_0^{-1} g_{\mathcal{A}}(x)\frac{\partial}{\partial x}g_{\mathcal{B}}(\alpha_0 x). \end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$h_{1010}(x) = \left(\alpha_0^{-1} g_{\mathcal{A}}(x)\frac{\partial}{\partial x}g_{\mathcal{B}}(\alpha_0 x) - \alpha_0^{-1} g_{\mathcal{B}}(\alpha_0 x)\frac{\partial}{\partial x}g_{\mathcal{A}}(x)\right)^-,$$

and

$$k_{1010}(x) = \left(g_{\mathcal{B}}(x)\frac{\partial}{\partial x}g_{\mathcal{A}}(\alpha_0^{-1}x) - g_{\mathcal{A}}(\alpha_0^{-1}x)\frac{\partial}{\partial x}g_{\mathcal{B}}(x)\right)^+.$$

We note that

$$\begin{aligned} h_{1001}(x) &= k_{1001}(\alpha_0 x) + g_{\mathcal{N}}(\alpha_0 x) q_{1000}(\alpha_0 x) + g_{\mathcal{A}}(x)\frac{\partial}{\partial x}k_{0001}(\alpha_0 x) \\ &\qquad\qquad + \alpha_0^{-\frac{1}{2}} g_{\mathcal{A}}(x)\frac{\partial}{\partial x}g_{\mathcal{N}}(\alpha_0 x) \\ &= k_{1001}(\alpha_0 x) - \frac{\alpha_0^{-\frac{1}{2}}}{2} g_{\mathcal{N}}(\alpha_0 x)\frac{\partial}{\partial x}g_{\mathcal{A}}(x) + \alpha_0^{-\frac{1}{2}} g_{\mathcal{A}}(x)\frac{\partial}{\partial x}g_{\mathcal{N}}(\alpha_0 x). \end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$h_{1001}(x) = \alpha_0^{-\frac{1}{2}}\left(g_{\mathcal{A}}(x)\frac{\partial}{\partial x}g_{\mathcal{N}}(\alpha_0 x) - \frac{1}{2}g_{\mathcal{N}}(\alpha_0 x)\frac{\partial}{\partial x}g_{\mathcal{A}}(x)\right)^{-},$$

and

$$k_{1001}(x) = \alpha_0^{\frac{1}{2}}\left(\frac{1}{2}g_{\mathcal{N}}(x)\frac{\partial}{\partial x}g_{\mathcal{A}}(\alpha_0^{-1}x) - g_{\mathcal{A}}(\alpha_0^{-1}x)\frac{\partial}{\partial x}g_{\mathcal{N}}(x)\right)^{+}.$$

We note that

$$\begin{aligned} h_{0110}(x) &= k_{0110}(\alpha_0 x) + \alpha_0^{-1} g_{\mathcal{B}}(\alpha_0 x)\frac{\partial}{\partial x}k_{0100}(\alpha_0 x) + \alpha_0^{\frac{1}{2}} g_{\mathcal{M}}(x) q_{0010}(\alpha_0 x) \\ &\qquad\qquad + \frac{\alpha_0^{-1}}{2} g_{\mathcal{M}}(x)\frac{\partial}{\partial x}g_{\mathcal{B}}(\alpha_0 x) \\ &= k_{0110}(\alpha_0 x) - \alpha_0^{-1} g_{\mathcal{B}}(\alpha_0 x)\frac{\partial}{\partial x}g_{\mathcal{M}}(x) + \frac{\alpha_0^{-1}}{2} g_{\mathcal{M}}(x)\frac{\partial}{\partial x}g_{\mathcal{B}}(\alpha_0 x). \end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$h_{0110}(x) = \alpha_0^{-1}\left(\frac{1}{2}g_{\mathcal{M}}(x)\frac{\partial}{\partial x}g_{\mathcal{B}}(\alpha_0 x) - g_{\mathcal{B}}(\alpha_0 x)\frac{\partial}{\partial x}g_{\mathcal{M}}(x)\right)^{-},$$

and

$$k_{0110}(x) = \left(g_{\mathcal{B}}(x)\frac{\partial}{\partial x}g_{\mathcal{M}}(\alpha_0^{-1}x) - \frac{1}{2}g_{\mathcal{M}}(\alpha_0^{-1}x)\frac{\partial}{\partial x}g_{\mathcal{B}}(x)\right)^{+}.$$

And finally, we note that

$$\begin{aligned} h_{0101}(x) &= k_{0101}(\alpha_0 x) + g_{\mathcal{N}}(\alpha_0 x) q_{0100}(\alpha_0 x) + \alpha_0^{\frac{1}{2}} g_{\mathcal{M}}(x) q_{0001}(\alpha_0 x) \\ &\qquad\qquad + \alpha_0^{-\frac{1}{2}} g_{\mathcal{M}}(x) g_{\mathcal{N}}(\alpha_0 x) \\ &= k_{0101}(\alpha_0 x) - \alpha_0^{-\frac{1}{2}} g_{\mathcal{N}}(\alpha_0 x) g_{\mathcal{M}}(x) + \alpha_0^{-\frac{1}{2}} g_{\mathcal{M}}(x) g_{\mathcal{N}}(\alpha_0 x). \end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$h_{0101}(x) = 2\alpha_0^{-\frac{1}{2}}\left(g_{\mathcal{M}}(x) g_{\mathcal{N}}(\alpha_0 x)\right)^{-},$$

and

$$k_{0101}(x) = -2\alpha_0^{-\frac{1}{2}}\left(g_{\mathcal{M}}(x) g_{\mathcal{N}}(\alpha_0 x)\right)^{+}.$$

Substituting these into (3.59) and (3.60), we obtain (3.56) and (3.57). □

Remark 3.27. We noted in Remark 3.23 that the geometric meaning of the left-hand side of (3.51) is the formal superconformal coordinate transition function of the sewn neighborhoods of a supersphere with tubes sewn from two canonical superspheres with tubes. If we denote the two canonical superspheres being sewn by $S\hat{\mathbb{C}} = \bigwedge_\infty \cup (\{\infty\} \times (\bigwedge_\infty)_S)$ with the i-th ($i \in \mathbb{Z}_+$) puncture (z_i, θ_i) of the first supersphere being sewn with the puncture at ∞ of the second supersphere, then geometrically $\bar{F}^{(1)} \circ s_{(z_i,\theta_i)}$ and $\bar{F}^{(2)}$ are formal versions of the two halves

$F^{(1)}_\Delta$ and $F^{(2)}_\Delta$ of the uniformizing function F which maps the genus-zero superconformal surface resulting from the sewn canonical superspheres with tubes to a super-Riemann sphere with tubes. Then this super-Riemann sphere with tubes can be mapped to a canonical supersphere with tubes via a global superconformal transformation, i.e., a superprojective transformation. Thus the meaning of $\bar{F}^{(1)} \circ s_{(z_i,\theta_i)}(x,\varphi)$ is the "formal superconformal coordinate transition function of the first canonical supersphere taking ∞ of the first canonical supersphere to ∞ of the resulting super-Riemann sphere", and the geometric meaning of $\bar{F}^{(2)}(x,\varphi)$ is the "formal superconformal coordinate transition function of the second canonical supersphere taking 0 of the second canonical supersphere to 0 of the resulting super-Riemann sphere". Furthermore Theorem 3.26 shows that the uniformizing function (2.48) which is a solution to the sewing equation along with the normalization and boundary conditions (2.49) – (2.57) does in fact depend algebraically on the local coordinate charts at the i-th puncture for the first supersphere being sewn and at infinity for the second supersphere being sewn. Moreover, this uniformizing function is uniquely determined by the formal sewing equation (3.58), the formal boundary conditions (3.52) - (3.55), and (3.56) and (3.57) which contain the normalization conditions.

Since $\bar{F}^{(1)}$ and $\bar{F}^{(2)}$ are superconformal with

$$\bar{F}^{(1)} \in x\mathbb{C}[\alpha_0^{\frac{1}{2}}, \alpha_0^{-\frac{1}{2}}][[\mathcal{A},\mathcal{B}]][\mathcal{M},\mathcal{N}][[x^{-1}]][\varphi]$$

where the even coefficient of φ in $\bar{F}^{(1)}$ is equal to one, and

$$\bar{F}^{(2)} \in x\mathbb{C}[\alpha_0^{\frac{1}{2}}, \alpha_0^{-\frac{1}{2}}][[\mathcal{A},\mathcal{B}]][\mathcal{M},\mathcal{N}][[x]][\varphi],$$

where the even coefficient of φ in $\bar{F}^{(2)}\big|_{(\mathcal{A},\mathcal{M})=\mathbf{0}}$ is equal to $\alpha_0^{-1/2}$, by Propositions 3.10 and 3.17, there exist a unique pair of sequences

$$(\Psi_j, \Psi_{j-\frac{1}{2}}) = (\Psi_j, \Psi_{j-\frac{1}{2}})(\alpha_0^{\frac{1}{2}}, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{M}, \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{N}) \tag{3.63}$$

in $\mathbb{C}[\alpha_0^{1/2}, \alpha_0^{-1/2}][[\mathcal{A},\mathcal{B}]][\mathcal{M},\mathcal{N}]$ for $j \in \mathbb{Z}$, such that

$$\bar{F}^{(1)}(x,\varphi) = \exp\Bigg(\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}\Big(\Psi_{-j}L_{-j}(x,\varphi) + \Psi_{-j+\frac{1}{2}}G_{-j+\frac{1}{2}}(x,\varphi)\Big)\Bigg)\cdot(x,\varphi) \tag{3.64}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{F}^{(2)}(x,\varphi) = \exp\left(-\Psi_0 2L_0(x,\varphi)\right)\cdot(\alpha_0^{\frac{1}{2}})^{2L_0(x,\varphi)}\cdot \\ \exp\Bigg(-\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}\Big(\Psi_j L_j(x,\varphi) + \Psi_{j-\frac{1}{2}}G_{j-\frac{1}{2}}(x,\varphi)\Big)\Bigg)\cdot(x,\varphi),\end{aligned} \tag{3.65}$$

i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} I\circ\bar{F}^{(1)}\circ I^{-1}(x,\varphi) &= \tilde{E}\Big(\big\{\Psi_{-j}, -i\Psi_{-j+\frac{1}{2}}\big\}_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}\Big)(x,\varphi) \\ &= \hat{E}\Big(1, \big\{\Psi_{-j}, -i\Psi_{-j+\frac{1}{2}}\big\}_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}\Big)(x,\varphi) \\ \bar{F}^{(2)}(x,\varphi) &= \hat{E}\Big(e^{\Psi_0}\alpha_0^{-\frac{1}{2}}, \big\{\Psi_j, \Psi_{j-\frac{1}{2}}\big\}_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}\Big)(x,\varphi). \end{aligned}$$

PROPOSITION 3.28. *For $j \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, we have* [3]

$$(\Psi_j, \Psi_{j-\frac{1}{2}}) = (-\mathcal{A}_j, -\mathcal{M}_{j-\frac{1}{2}}) + \mathcal{P}_j(\alpha_0^{\frac{1}{2}}, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{M}, \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{N}), \tag{3.66}$$

$$(\Psi_{-j}, \Psi_{-j+\frac{1}{2}}) = (-\alpha_0^{-j}\mathcal{B}_j, -\alpha_0^{-j+\frac{1}{2}}\mathcal{N}_{j-\frac{1}{2}}) + \mathcal{P}_{-j}(\alpha_0^{\frac{1}{2}}, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{M}, \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{N}), \tag{3.67}$$

$$\Psi_0 = 0 + \mathcal{P}_0(\alpha_0^{\frac{1}{2}}, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{M}, \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{N}), \tag{3.68}$$

where each $\mathcal{P}_j(\alpha_0^{1/2}, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{M}, \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{N})$, for $j \in \mathbb{Z}$, contains only terms with total degree at least one in the $\mathcal{A}_k$'s and $\mathcal{M}_{k-1/2}$'s, for $k \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, and with total degree at least one in the $\mathcal{B}_k$'s and $\mathcal{N}_{k-1/2}$'s, for $k \in \mathbb{Z}_+$. Both

$$\exp\Bigg(\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}\Big(\Psi_{-j}L_{-j}(x,\varphi) + \Psi_{-j+\frac{1}{2}}G_{-j+\frac{1}{2}}(x,\varphi)\Big)\Bigg) \tag{3.69}$$

and

$$\exp\Bigg(\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}\Big(\Psi_{j}L_{j}(x,\varphi) + \Psi_{j-\frac{1}{2}}G_{j-\frac{1}{2}}(x,\varphi)\Big)\Bigg) \tag{3.70}$$

are in the algebra $((\mathrm{End}\ \mathbb{C}[x, x^{-1}, \varphi])[\alpha_0^{1/2}, \alpha_0^{-1/2}][[\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}]][\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N}])^0$, and in this algebra we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\exp\Bigg(-\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}\Big(\mathcal{A}_jL_j(x,\varphi) + \mathcal{M}_{j-\frac{1}{2}}G_{j-\frac{1}{2}}(x,\varphi)\Big)\Bigg) \cdot (\alpha_0^{\frac{1}{2}})^{-2L_0(x,\varphi)} \cdot \\ &\qquad\qquad \exp\Bigg(-\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}\Big(\mathcal{B}_jL_{-j}(x,\varphi) + \mathcal{N}_{j-\frac{1}{2}}G_{-j+\frac{1}{2}}(x,\varphi)\Big)\Bigg) \\ &= \exp\Bigg(\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}\Big(\Psi_{-j}L_{-j}(x,\varphi) + \Psi_{-j+\frac{1}{2}}G_{-j+\frac{1}{2}}(x,\varphi)\Big)\Bigg) \cdot \\ &\qquad\qquad \exp\Bigg(\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}\Big(\Psi_{j}L_{j}(x,\varphi) + \Psi_{j-\frac{1}{2}}G_{j-\frac{1}{2}}(x,\varphi)\Big)\Bigg) \cdot \\ &\qquad\qquad\qquad (\alpha_0^{\frac{1}{2}})^{-2L_0(x,\varphi)} \cdot \exp\Big(\Psi_0 2L_0(x,\varphi)\Big). \end{aligned} \tag{3.71}$$

PROOF. Equations (3.66), (3.67), and (3.68) follow immediately from (3.56), (3.57), (3.64) and (3.65). By (3.63), we know that (3.69) and (3.70) are in the algebra $((\mathrm{End}\ \mathbb{C}[[x, x^{-1}]][\varphi])[\alpha_0^{1/2}, \alpha_0^{-1/2}][[\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}]][\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N}])^0$. By definition, (3.69) and (3.70) applied to (x, φ) are in

$$x\mathbb{C}[\alpha_0^{\frac{1}{2}}, \alpha_0^{-\frac{1}{2}}][x^{-1}, \varphi][[\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}]][\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N}] \quad \text{and} \quad x\mathbb{C}[\alpha_0^{\frac{1}{2}}, \alpha_0^{-\frac{1}{2}}][x, \varphi][[\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}]][\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N}],$$

respectively, and we have

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{F}^{(1)}\big|_{(\mathcal{A},\mathcal{M})=(\mathcal{B},\mathcal{N})=\mathbf{0}} &= (x, \varphi) \\ \bar{F}^{(2)}\big|_{(\mathcal{A},\mathcal{M})=(\mathcal{B},\mathcal{N})=\mathbf{0}} &= (\alpha_0^{-1}x, \alpha_0^{-\frac{1}{2}}\varphi). \end{aligned}$$

---

[3] There is a misprint in equation (2.2.27) of Proposition 2.2.5 in [**H2**] which gives the nonsuper version of equation (3.67) above. The first term in the right-hand side of (2.2.27) should be $-\alpha_0^{-j}\mathcal{B}_j$, not $-\alpha_0^{j}\mathcal{B}_j$ as stated.

Thus for any $H(x,\varphi) \in \mathbb{C}[\alpha_0^{1/2}, \alpha_0^{-1/2}][x, x^{-1}, \varphi][[\mathcal{A},\mathcal{B}]][\mathcal{M},\mathcal{N}]$, we have

$$H\left(\exp\left(\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}\left(\Psi_{-j}L_{-j}(x,\varphi) + \Psi_{-j+\frac{1}{2}}G_{-j+\frac{1}{2}}(x,\varphi)\right)\right)\cdot(x,\varphi)\right) \tag{3.72}$$

and

$$H\left(\exp\left(\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}\left(\Psi_{j}L_{j}(x,\varphi) + \Psi_{j-\frac{1}{2}}G_{j-\frac{1}{2}}(x,\varphi)\right)\right)\cdot(x,\varphi)\right) \tag{3.73}$$

are in $\mathbb{C}[\alpha_0^{1/2}, \alpha_0^{-1/2}][x, x^{-1}, \varphi][[\mathcal{A},\mathcal{B}]][\mathcal{M},\mathcal{N}]$. Then by Proposition 3.12, (3.72) is equal to

$$\exp\left(\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}\left(\Psi_{-j}L_{-j}(x,\varphi) + \Psi_{-j+\frac{1}{2}}G_{-j+\frac{1}{2}}(x,\varphi)\right)\right)\cdot H(x,\varphi),$$

and by Proposition 3.20, (3.73) is equal to

$$\exp\left(\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}\left(\Psi_{j}L_{j}(x,\varphi) + \Psi_{j-\frac{1}{2}}G_{j-\frac{1}{2}}(x,\varphi)\right)\right)\cdot H(x,\varphi).$$

Thus the above expressions are also in

$$x\mathbb{C}[\alpha_0^{\frac{1}{2}}, \alpha_0^{-\frac{1}{2}}][x^{-1},\varphi][[\mathcal{A},\mathcal{B}]][\mathcal{M},\mathcal{N}] \quad \text{and} \quad x\mathbb{C}[\alpha_0^{\frac{1}{2}}, \alpha_0^{-\frac{1}{2}}][x,\varphi][[\mathcal{A},\mathcal{B}]][\mathcal{M},\mathcal{N}],$$

respectively. Since $H(x,\varphi)$ was arbitrary, (3.69) and (3.70) are in

$$(\mathrm{End}\,\mathbb{C}[x,x^{-1},\varphi])[\alpha_0^{\frac{1}{2}}, \alpha_0^{-\frac{1}{2}}][[\mathcal{A},\mathcal{B}]][\mathcal{M},\mathcal{N}].$$

Furthermore, they are obviously even.

To prove (3.71), we note that using Propositions 3.12 and 3.20 repeatedly and by (3.65), we have

$$\bar{F}^{(2)} \circ (H^{(2)}_{\mathcal{B},\mathcal{N}})^{-1} \circ I \circ H^{(1)}_{\alpha_0^{1/2},\mathcal{A},\mathcal{M}}(x,\varphi)$$

$$= \exp\left(-\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}\left(\mathcal{A}_jL_j(x,\varphi) + \mathcal{M}_{j-\frac{1}{2}}G_{j-\frac{1}{2}}\right)\right)\cdot(\alpha_0^{\frac{1}{2}})^{-2L_0(x,\varphi)}\cdot$$

$$\exp\left(-\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}\left(\mathcal{B}_jL_{-j}(x,\varphi) + \mathcal{N}_{j-\frac{1}{2}}G_{-j+\frac{1}{2}}(x,\varphi)\right)\right)\cdot(\alpha_0^{\frac{1}{2}})^{2L_0(x,\varphi)}\cdot$$

$$\exp\left(\Psi_0 2L_0(x,\varphi)\right)\exp\left(-\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}\left(\Psi_jL_j(x,\varphi) + \Psi_{j-\frac{1}{2}}G_{j-\frac{1}{2}}(x,\varphi)\right)\right)\cdot(x,\varphi)$$

in $\mathbb{C}[x, x^{-1}, \varphi][\alpha_0^{1/2}, \alpha_0^{-1/2}][[\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}]][\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N}]$. Using Propositions 3.12 and 3.20 again, we see that for $H(x, \varphi) \in \mathbb{C}[x, x^{-1}, \varphi][\alpha_0^{1/2}, \alpha_0^{-1/2}][[\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}]][\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N}]$, the expressions

$$\exp\Bigg(-\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}\Big(\mathcal{A}_j L_j(x,\varphi) + \mathcal{M}_{j-\frac{1}{2}} G_{j-\frac{1}{2}}(x,\varphi)\Big)\Bigg) \cdot (\alpha_0^{\frac{1}{2}})^{-2L_0(x,\varphi)} \cdot$$
$$\exp\Bigg(-\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}\Big(\mathcal{B}_j L_{-j}(x,\varphi) + \mathcal{N}_{j-\frac{1}{2}} G_{-j+\frac{1}{2}}(x,\varphi)\Big)\Bigg) \cdot (\alpha_0^{\frac{1}{2}})^{2L_0(x,\varphi)} \cdot$$
$$\exp\left(\Psi_0 2L_0(x,\varphi)\right) \exp\Bigg(-\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}\Big(\Psi_j L_j(x,\varphi) + \Psi_{j-\frac{1}{2}} G_{j-\frac{1}{2}}(x,\varphi)\Big)\Bigg) \cdot H(x,\varphi)$$

and

$$H\Bigg(\exp\Bigg(-\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}\Big(\mathcal{A}_j L_j(x,\varphi) + \mathcal{M}_{j-\frac{1}{2}} G_{j-\frac{1}{2}}(x,\varphi)\Big)\Bigg) \cdot (\alpha_0^{\frac{1}{2}})^{-2L_0(x,\varphi)} \cdot$$
$$\exp\Bigg(-\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}\Big(\mathcal{B}_j L_{-j}(x,\varphi) + \mathcal{N}_{j-\frac{1}{2}} G_{-j+\frac{1}{2}}(x,\varphi)\Big)\Bigg) \cdot (\alpha_0^{\frac{1}{2}})^{2L_0(x,\varphi)} \cdot$$
$$\exp\left(\Psi_0 2L_0(x,\varphi)\right) \exp\Bigg(-\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}\Big(\Psi_j L_j(x,\varphi) + \Psi_{j-\frac{1}{2}} G_{j-\frac{1}{2}}(x,\varphi)\Big)\Bigg) \cdot (x,\varphi)\Bigg)$$

exist in $\mathbb{C}[x, x^{-1}, \varphi][\alpha_0^{1/2}, \alpha_0^{-1/2}][[\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}]][\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N}]$ and are equal. Thus by (3.64), (3.65) and (3.58), we have

$$\exp\Bigg(\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}\Big(\Psi_{-j} L_{-j}(x,\varphi) + \Psi_{-j+\frac{1}{2}} G_{-j+\frac{1}{2}}(x,\varphi)\Big)\Bigg) \cdot H(x,\varphi) \tag{3.74}$$

$$= \exp\Bigg(-\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}\Big(\mathcal{A}_j L_j(x,\varphi) + \mathcal{M}_{j-\frac{1}{2}} G_{j-\frac{1}{2}}(x,\varphi)\Big)\Bigg) \cdot (\alpha_0^{\frac{1}{2}})^{-2L_0(x,\varphi)} \cdot$$
$$\exp\Bigg(-\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}\Big(\mathcal{B}_j L{-}j(x,\varphi) + \mathcal{N}_{j-\frac{1}{2}} G_{-j+\frac{1}{2}}(x,\varphi)\Big)\Bigg) \cdot (\alpha_0^{\frac{1}{2}})^{2L_0(x,\varphi)} \cdot$$
$$\exp\left(\Psi_0 2L_0(x,\varphi)\right) \cdot \exp\Bigg(-\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}\Big(\Psi_j L_j(x,\varphi) + \Psi_{j-\frac{1}{2}} G_{j-\frac{1}{2}}(x,\varphi)\Big)\Bigg) \cdot H(x,\varphi).$$

Taking $H(x, \varphi)$ to be

$$\exp\Bigg(\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}\Big(\Psi_j L_j(x,\varphi) + \Psi_{j-\frac{1}{2}} G_{j-\frac{1}{2}}(x,\varphi)\Big)\Bigg) \cdot (\alpha_0^{\frac{1}{2}})^{-2L_0(x,\varphi)} \cdot$$
$$\exp\left(\Psi_0 2L_0(x,\varphi)\right) \cdot H_1(x,\varphi)$$

where H_1 is any element of $\mathbb{C}[x, x^{-1}, \varphi]$, equation (3.74) becomes

$$\exp\Bigg(-\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}\Bigg(\mathcal{A}_j L_j(x,\varphi) + \mathcal{M}_{j-\frac{1}{2}} G_{j-\frac{1}{2}}(x,\varphi)\Bigg)\Bigg)\cdot (\alpha_0^{\frac{1}{2}})^{-2L_0(x,\varphi)}\cdot$$
$$\exp\Bigg(-\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}\Bigg(\mathcal{B}_j L_{-j}(x,\varphi) + \mathcal{N}_{j-\frac{1}{2}} G_{-j+\frac{1}{2}}(x,\varphi)\Bigg)\Bigg)\cdot H_1(x,\varphi)$$
$$= \exp\Bigg(\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}\Bigg(\Psi_{-j} L_{-j}(x,\varphi) + \Psi_{-j+\frac{1}{2}} G_{-j+\frac{1}{2}}(x,\varphi)\Bigg)\Bigg)\cdot$$
$$\exp\Bigg(\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}\Bigg(\Psi_j L_j(x,\varphi) + \Psi_{j-\frac{1}{2}} G_{j-\frac{1}{2}}(x,\varphi)\Bigg)\Bigg)\cdot (\alpha_0^{\frac{1}{2}})^{-2L_0(x,\varphi)}\cdot$$
$$\exp\left(\Psi_0 2L_0(x,\varphi)\right)\cdot H_1(x,\varphi).$$

Since H_1 is an arbitrary element of $\mathbb{C}[x, x^{-1}, \varphi]$, we obtain (3.71). □

Remark 3.29. The proposition above can be understood algebraically as in some sense establishing the relation between a "non-normally ordered" product (the left-hand side of (3.71)) and a "normally ordered" product (the right-hand side of (3.71)), where by "normally ordered" we mean ordered so that one first acts by "lowering operators" and then by "raising operators" (cf. [**FLM**]). Thus if one thinks of the superderivations in (3.71) as acting on an element in $\mathbb{C}[x^{-1}, x, \varphi]$, then the operators $L_j(x,\varphi)$ and $G_{j-1/2}(x,\varphi)$ raise the degree of this element in terms of negative powers of x for $j < 0$ and lower the degree for $j > 0$. The significance of such normal ordering is due to the fact that superconformal field theory is mainly interested in "positive energy representations" of the $N = 1$ Neveu-Schwarz algebra (see Section 3.4 and 3.7), e.g., $N = 1$ vertex operator superalgebras (cf. [**B3**]). For such representations, acting by an expression such as the left-hand side of (3.71) is not well defined, but acting by an expression such as the right-hand side of (3.71) is well defined.

The identities proved in the two propositions below can be used to determine explicitly the resulting canonical supersphere from the sewing together of two canonical superspheres in certain cases [**B1**]. In addition, in Section 3.6 and 3.7, we show that these identities give certain analogous identities for any representation of the $N = 1$ Neveu-Schwarz algebra and have certain nice properties for positive-energy representations.

Let [4]

$$(\tilde{x}, \tilde{\varphi}) = (H^{(1)}_{\alpha_0^{1/2},\mathcal{A},\mathcal{M}})^{-1}(x,\varphi) \in (\alpha_0^{-1}x, \alpha_0^{-\frac{1}{2}}\varphi) + x\mathbb{C}[x,\varphi][\alpha_0^{-\frac{1}{2}}][[\mathcal{A}]][\mathcal{M}].$$

Let w be another even formal variable and ρ another odd formal variable, and define

$$s_{(x,\varphi)}(w,\rho) = (w - x - \rho\varphi, \rho - \varphi).$$

---

[4] There is a misprint in [**H2**] in the analogous definition of the body of $\tilde{x}$ in the nonsuper case. On p.58 in [**H2**], in defining $y_{\mathcal{A},\alpha_0}$, the function $f_{\mathcal{A},\alpha_0}$ in the expression is $f^{(1)}_{\mathcal{A},\alpha_0}$, i.e., $y_{\mathcal{A},\alpha_0} = (f^{(1)}_{\mathcal{A},\alpha_0})^{-1}(y)$.

Then $s_{(x,\varphi)} \circ H^{(1)}_{\alpha_0^{1/2},\mathcal{A},\mathcal{M}} \circ s^{-1}_{(\tilde{x},\tilde{\varphi})}(\alpha_0^{-1}w, \alpha_0^{-1/2}\rho)$ is in

$$w\mathbb{C}[x,\varphi][\alpha_0^{\frac{1}{2}},\alpha_0^{-\frac{1}{2}}][[\mathcal{A}]][\mathcal{M}][[w]] \oplus \rho\mathbb{C}[x,\varphi][\alpha_0^{\frac{1}{2}},\alpha_0^{-\frac{1}{2}}][[\mathcal{A}]][\mathcal{M}][[w]],$$

is superconformal in (w,ρ), (i.e., letting $D = \frac{\partial}{\partial \rho} + \rho\frac{\partial}{\partial w}$, then $D\tilde{w} = \tilde{\rho}D\tilde{\rho}$ for $(\tilde{w},\tilde{\rho}) = s_{(x,\varphi)} \circ H^{(1)}_{\alpha_0^{1/2},\mathcal{A},\mathcal{M}} \circ s^{-1}_{(\tilde{x},\tilde{\varphi})}(\alpha_0^{-1}w, \alpha_0^{-1/2}\rho)$), and the even coefficient of the monomial ρ is an element in

$$1 + x\mathbb{C}[x][\alpha_0^{\frac{1}{2}},\alpha_0^{-\frac{1}{2}}][[\mathcal{A}]][\mathcal{M}] \oplus \varphi\mathbb{C}[x][\alpha_0^{\frac{1}{2}},\alpha_0^{-\frac{1}{2}}][[\mathcal{A}]][\mathcal{M}].$$

Let

$$\Theta_j^{(1)} = \Theta_j^{(1)}(\alpha_0^{\frac{1}{2}},\mathcal{A},\mathcal{M},(x,\varphi)) \in \mathbb{C}[x,\varphi][\alpha_0^{\frac{1}{2}},\alpha_0^{-\frac{1}{2}}][[\mathcal{A}]][\mathcal{M}],$$

for $j \in \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{N}$, be defined by

$$\begin{aligned} (3.75)\quad & \Big(\exp(\Theta_0^{(1)}(\alpha_0^{\frac{1}{2}},\mathcal{A},\mathcal{M},(x,\varphi)), \Big\{\Theta_j^{(1)}(\alpha_0^{\frac{1}{2}},\mathcal{A},\mathcal{M},(x,\varphi)), \\ & \qquad\qquad \Theta_{j-\frac{1}{2}}^{(1)}(\alpha_0^{\frac{1}{2}},\mathcal{A},\mathcal{M},(x,\varphi))\Big\}_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}\Big) \\ = \;& \hat{E}^{-1}(s_{(x,\varphi)} \circ H^{(1)}_{\alpha_0^{1/2},\mathcal{A},\mathcal{M}} \circ s^{-1}_{(\tilde{x},\tilde{\varphi})}(\alpha_0^{-1}w, \alpha_0^{-\frac{1}{2}}\rho)). \end{aligned}$$

In other words, the $\Theta_j^{(1)}$'s are determined uniquely by

$$\begin{aligned} & s_{(x,\varphi)} \circ H^{(1)}_{\alpha_0^{1/2},\mathcal{A},\mathcal{M}} \circ s^{-1}_{(\tilde{x},\tilde{\varphi})}(\alpha_0^{-1}w, \alpha_0^{-\frac{1}{2}}\rho) \\ = \;& \exp\Bigg(-\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}\Big(\Theta_j^{(1)}L_j(w,\rho) + \Theta_{j-\frac{1}{2}}^{(1)}G_{j-\frac{1}{2}}(w,\rho)\Big)\Bigg)\cdot \\ & \qquad\qquad \exp\Big(-\Theta_0^{(1)}2L_0(w,\rho)\Big)\cdot(w,\rho) \\ = \;& \exp\Bigg(\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}\Bigg(\Theta_j^{(1)}\Big(w^{j+1}\frac{\partial}{\partial w} + \Big(\frac{j+1}{2}\Big)\rho w^j\frac{\partial}{\partial \rho}\Big) + \Theta_{j-\frac{1}{2}}^{(1)}w^j\Big(\frac{\partial}{\partial \rho} - \rho\frac{\partial}{\partial w}\Big)\Bigg)\Bigg)\cdot \\ & \qquad\qquad \exp\Big(\Theta_0^{(1)}\Big(2w\frac{\partial}{\partial w} + \rho\frac{\partial}{\partial \rho}\Big)\Big)\cdot(w,\rho). \end{aligned}$$

This formal power series in (w,ρ) gives the formal local superconformal coordinate at a puncture of the canonical supersphere obtained from the sewing together of two particular canonical superspheres with punctures. Specifically, this is the formal power series giving the resulting local coordinate at the n-th puncture, given formally by $(H^{(1)}_{\alpha_0^{1/2},\mathcal{A},\mathcal{M}})^{-1}(x,\varphi)$, of the supersphere $S_1\; {}_n\infty_0\; S_2$ with $1 + (n+1)$ tubes obtained by sewing the supersphere S_2 with $1+2$ punctures given by

$$S_2 = ((z,\theta); I(w,\rho), s_{(z,\theta)}(w,\rho), (w,\rho))$$

to the n-th puncture of a supersphere S_1 with $1+n$ tubes where the local coordinate vanishing at the n-th puncture of S_1 is given formally by $H^{(1)}_{\alpha_0^{1/2},\mathcal{A},\mathcal{M}}(w,\rho)$ and where $(x,\varphi) = (z,\theta)$.

Proposition 3.30. *In the* $\mathbb{C}[x,\varphi][\alpha_0^{1/2},\alpha_0^{-1/2}][[\mathcal{A}]][\mathcal{M}]$*-envelope of the superalgebra* $\mathrm{End}\,\mathbb{C}[w,w^{-1},\rho]$*, i.e., in the algebra*

$$((\mathrm{End}\,\mathbb{C}[w,w^{-1},\rho])[x,\varphi][\alpha_0^{\frac{1}{2}},\alpha_0^{-\frac{1}{2}}][[\mathcal{A}]][\mathcal{M}])^0 \\ \subset (\mathrm{End}\,\mathbb{C}[w,w^{-1},\rho][x,\varphi][\alpha_0^{\frac{1}{2}},\alpha_0^{-\frac{1}{2}}][[\mathcal{A}]][\mathcal{M}])^0,$$

the following identity holds. [5]

$$\begin{aligned}(3.76)\quad &\exp\Bigg(-\sum_{m=-1}^{\infty}\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}\binom{j+1}{m+1}\alpha_0^{-j}x^{j-m} \\ &\qquad\Bigg(\bigg(\mathcal{A}_j+2\left(\frac{j-m}{j+1}\right)\alpha_0^{\frac{1}{2}}x^{-1}\varphi\mathcal{M}_{j-\frac{1}{2}}\bigg)\cdot L_m(w,\rho) \\ &\qquad\quad +\ x^{-1}\bigg(\left(\frac{j-m}{j+1}\right)\alpha_0^{\frac{1}{2}}\mathcal{M}_{j-\frac{1}{2}}+\varphi\frac{(j-m)}{2}\mathcal{A}_j\bigg)G_{m+\frac{1}{2}}(w,\rho)\Bigg)\Bigg)\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}&= \exp\Big((\tilde{x}-\alpha_0^{-1}x)L_{-1}(w,\rho)+(\tilde{\varphi}-\alpha_0^{-\frac{1}{2}}\varphi)G_{-\frac{1}{2}}(w,\rho)\Big)\cdot \\ &\qquad \exp\Bigg(-\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}\Big(\Theta_j^{(1)}L_j(w,\rho)+\Theta_{j-\frac{1}{2}}^{(1)}G_{j-\frac{1}{2}}(w,\rho)\Big)\Bigg)\cdot\exp\Big(-\Theta_0^{(1)}2L_0(w,\rho)\Big),\end{aligned}$$

for $(\tilde{x},\tilde{\varphi})=(H^{(1)}_{\alpha_0^{1/2},\mathcal{A},\mathcal{M}})^{-1}(x,\varphi)$.

Proof. Taylor's theorem implies that for any $H(w,\rho)\in R[[w,w^{-1}]][\rho]$

$$\exp\left(x\frac{\partial}{\partial w}+\varphi\Big(\frac{\partial}{\partial\rho}-\rho\frac{\partial}{\partial w}\Big)\right)\cdot H(w,\rho)=H(w+x+\rho\varphi,\rho+\varphi),$$

i.e.,

$$e^{-xL_{-1}(w,\rho)-\varphi G_{-\frac{1}{2}}(w,\rho)}H(w,\rho)=H\circ s^{-1}_{(x,\varphi)}(w,\rho).$$

---

[5] There is a misprint in the analogous nonsuper version of equation (3.76) in [**H2**]. Equation (2.2.31) in [**H2**] should have no α_0 in front of the exponential expression on the left-hand side. As usual, one can always obtain the nonsuper case from the super case by setting all odd formal variables equal to zero.

Thus

$$\begin{aligned}
&s_{(x,\varphi)} \circ H^{(1)}_{\alpha_0^{1/2},\mathcal{A},\mathcal{M}} \circ s^{-1}_{(\alpha_0^{-1}x,\alpha_0^{-1/2}\varphi)}(\alpha_0^{-1}w,\alpha_0^{-\frac{1}{2}}\rho)\\
&\quad= s_{(x,\varphi)} \circ H^{(1)}_{\alpha_0^{1/2},\mathcal{A},\mathcal{M}}\big(\alpha_0^{-1}(w+x+\rho\varphi),\alpha_0^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\rho+\varphi)\big)\\
&\quad= s_{(x,\varphi)} \circ H^{(1)}_{\alpha_0^{1/2},\mathcal{A},\mathcal{M}}\big(\alpha_0^{-1}w+\tilde{x}+\alpha_0^{-\frac{1}{2}}\rho\tilde{\varphi}+(\alpha_0^{-1}x-\tilde{x})+\alpha_0^{-\frac{1}{2}}\rho(\alpha_0^{-\frac{1}{2}}\varphi-\tilde{\varphi}),\\
&\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\alpha_0^{-\frac{1}{2}}\rho+\tilde{\varphi}+(\alpha_0^{-\frac{1}{2}}\varphi-\tilde{\varphi})\big)\\
&\quad= \exp\left(-(\tilde{x}-\alpha_0^{-1}x)\frac{\partial}{\partial w}-(\tilde{\varphi}-\alpha_0^{-\frac{1}{2}}\varphi)\Big(\frac{\partial}{\partial\rho}-\rho\frac{\partial}{\partial w}\Big)\right)\cdot\\
&\qquad\qquad\qquad s_{(x,\varphi)} \circ H^{(1)}_{\alpha_0^{1/2},\mathcal{A},\mathcal{M}}\big(\alpha_0^{-1}w+\tilde{x}+\alpha_0^{-\frac{1}{2}}\rho\tilde{\varphi},\alpha_0^{-\frac{1}{2}}\rho+\tilde{\varphi}\big)\\
&\quad= \exp\Big((\tilde{x}-\alpha_0^{-1}x)L_{-1}(w,\rho)+(\tilde{\varphi}-\alpha_0^{-\frac{1}{2}}\varphi)G_{-\frac{1}{2}}(w,\rho)\Big)\cdot\\
&\qquad\qquad\qquad s_{(x,\varphi)} \circ H^{(1)}_{\alpha_0^{1/2},\mathcal{A},\mathcal{M}} \circ s^{-1}_{(\tilde{x},\tilde{\varphi})}(\alpha_0^{-1}w,\alpha_0^{-\frac{1}{2}}\rho)\\
&\quad= \exp\Big((\tilde{x}-\alpha_0^{-1}x)L_{-1}(w,\rho)+(\tilde{\varphi}-\alpha_0^{-\frac{1}{2}}\varphi)G_{-\frac{1}{2}}(w,\rho)\Big)\cdot\\
&\qquad\qquad \exp\left(-\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}\left(\Theta_j^{(1)}L_j(w,\rho)+\Theta^{(1)}_{j-\frac{1}{2}}G_{j-\frac{1}{2}}(w,\rho)\right)\right)\cdot\\
&\qquad\qquad\qquad \exp\Big(-\Theta_0^{(1)}2L_0(w,\rho)\Big)\cdot(w,\rho).
\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, since

$$\begin{aligned}
&H^{(1)}_{\alpha_0^{1/2},\mathcal{A},\mathcal{M}}(w,\rho)\\
&\quad= \exp\left(-\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}\left(\mathcal{A}_jL_j(w,\rho)+\mathcal{M}_{j-\frac{1}{2}}G_{j-\frac{1}{2}}(w,\rho)\right)\right)\cdot(\alpha_0^{\frac{1}{2}})^{-2L_0(w,\rho)}\cdot(w,\rho),
\end{aligned}$$

by Proposition 3.20, we have

$$s_{(x,\varphi)} \circ H^{(1)}_{\alpha_0^{1/2},\mathcal{A},\mathcal{M}} \circ s^{-1}_{(\alpha_0^{-1}x,\alpha_0^{-1/2}\varphi)}(\alpha_0^{-1}w,\alpha_0^{-\frac{1}{2}}\rho)$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
= \; s_{(x,\varphi)}\Bigg(\exp\Bigg(\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}\Big(\mathcal{A}_j\Big(&\alpha_0^{-j-1}(x+w+\rho\varphi)^{j+1}\frac{\partial}{\partial\alpha_0^{-1}(x+w+\rho\varphi)}\\
&+\;\frac{(j+1)}{2}\alpha_0^{-j-\frac{1}{2}}(\rho+\varphi)(x+w+\rho\varphi)^{j}\frac{\partial}{\partial\alpha_0^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\rho+\varphi)}\Big)\\
&+\;\mathcal{M}_{j-\frac{1}{2}}\alpha_0^{-j}(x+w+\rho\varphi)^{j}\Big(\frac{\partial}{\partial\alpha_0^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\rho+\varphi)}\\
&-\;\alpha_0^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\rho+\varphi)\frac{\partial}{\partial\alpha_0^{-1}(x+w+\rho\varphi)}\Big)\Big)\Bigg)\cdot\\
&(\alpha_0^{\frac{1}{2}})^{2\left(\alpha_0^{-1}(x+w+\rho\varphi)\frac{\partial}{\partial\alpha_0^{-1}(x+w+\rho\varphi)}+\frac{1}{2}\alpha_0^{-1/2}(\rho+\varphi)\frac{\partial}{\partial\alpha_0^{-1/2}(\rho+\varphi)}\right)}\cdot\\
&\qquad\qquad(\alpha_0^{-1}(x+w+\rho\varphi),\alpha_0^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\rho+\varphi))\Bigg)
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
= \; s_{(x,\varphi)}\Bigg(\exp\Bigg(\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}\Big(\mathcal{A}_j\Big(&\alpha_0^{-j}(x+w+\rho\varphi)^{j+1}\frac{\partial}{\partial w}\\
&+\;\frac{(j+1)}{2}\alpha_0^{-j}(\rho+\varphi)(x+w)^{j}\Big(\frac{\partial}{\partial\rho}-\varphi\frac{\partial}{\partial w}\Big)\Big)\\
+\;\mathcal{M}_{j-\frac{1}{2}}\alpha_0^{-j+\frac{1}{2}}&(x+w+\rho\varphi)^{j}\Big(\Big(\frac{\partial}{\partial\rho}-\varphi\frac{\partial}{\partial w}\Big)-(\rho+\varphi)\frac{\partial}{\partial w}\Big)\Big)\Bigg)\cdot\\
&\qquad\qquad(x+w+\rho\varphi,\rho+\varphi)\Bigg)
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
= \; \exp\Bigg(\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}\Big(\mathcal{A}_j\Big(&\alpha_0^{-j}(x+w+\rho\varphi)^{j+1}\frac{\partial}{\partial w}\\
&+\;\frac{(j+1)}{2}\alpha_0^{-j}(\rho+\varphi)(x+w)^{j}\Big(\frac{\partial}{\partial\rho}-\varphi\frac{\partial}{\partial w}\Big)\Big)\\
&+\;\mathcal{M}_{j-\frac{1}{2}}\alpha_0^{-j+\frac{1}{2}}(x+w+\rho\varphi)^{j}\Big(\frac{\partial}{\partial\rho}-(\rho+2\varphi)\frac{\partial}{\partial w}\Big)\Big)\Bigg)\cdot(w,\rho)
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
= \ & \exp\Bigg(\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}\sum_{m\in\mathbb{N}}\bigg(\mathcal{A}_j\alpha_0^{-j}\Big(\binom{j+1}{m}x^{j-m+1}w^m\frac{\partial}{\partial w}\\
&\quad + \ (j+1)\binom{j}{m}\rho\varphi x^{j-m}w^m\frac{\partial}{\partial w}+\frac{(j+1)}{2}\binom{j}{m}(\rho+\varphi)x^{j-m}w^m\frac{\partial}{\partial \rho}\\
&\qquad\qquad - \ \frac{(j+1)}{2}\binom{j}{m}\rho\varphi x^{j-m}w^m\frac{\partial}{\partial w}\Big)\\
&\quad + \ \mathcal{M}_{j-\frac{1}{2}}\alpha_0^{-j+\frac{1}{2}}\Big(\binom{j}{m}x^{j-m}w^m\frac{\partial}{\partial \rho}+j\binom{j-1}{m}\rho\varphi x^{j-m-1}w^m\frac{\partial}{\partial \rho}\\
&\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad - \ (\rho+2\varphi)\binom{j}{m}x^{j-m}w^m\frac{\partial}{\partial w}\Big)\bigg)\Bigg)\cdot(w,\rho)
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
= \ & \exp\Bigg(\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}\sum_{m=-1}^{\infty}\bigg(\binom{j+1}{m+1}\alpha_0^{-j}x^{j-m}(\mathcal{A}_j+2\left(\frac{j-m}{j+1}\right)x^{-1}\varphi\alpha_0^{\frac{1}{2}}\mathcal{M}_{j-\frac{1}{2}})\cdot\\
&\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad w^{m+1}\frac{\partial}{\partial w}\\
&\quad + \ \binom{j+1}{m+1}\alpha_0^{-j}x^{j-m}(\mathcal{A}_j+2\left(\frac{j-m}{j+1}\right)x^{-1}\varphi\alpha_0^{\frac{1}{2}}\mathcal{M}_{j-\frac{1}{2}})\frac{(m+1)}{2}\rho w^m\frac{\partial}{\partial \rho}\\
&\quad + \ \binom{j+1}{m+1}\alpha_0^{-j}x^{j-m-1}\Big(\left(\frac{j-m}{j+1}\right)\alpha_0^{\frac{1}{2}}\mathcal{M}_{j-\frac{1}{2}}+\varphi\frac{(j-m)}{2}\mathcal{A}_j\Big)w^{m+1}\frac{\partial}{\partial \rho}\\
&\quad - \ \binom{j+1}{m+1}\alpha_0^{-j}x^{j-m-1}\Big(\left(\frac{j-m}{j+1}\right)x^{-1}\alpha_0^{\frac{1}{2}}\mathcal{M}_{j-\frac{1}{2}}+\varphi\frac{(j-m)}{2}\mathcal{A}_j\Big)\cdot\\
&\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad \rho w^{m+1}\frac{\partial}{\partial w}\bigg)\Bigg)\cdot(w,\rho).
\end{aligned}
$$

Thus

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\exp\Bigg(-\sum_{m=-1}^{\infty}\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}\binom{j+1}{m+1}\alpha_0^{-j}x^{j-m}\\
&\qquad\qquad\bigg(\Big(\mathcal{A}_j+2\left(\frac{j-m}{j+1}\right)\alpha_0^{\frac{1}{2}}x^{-1}\varphi\mathcal{M}_{j-\frac{1}{2}}\Big)\cdot L_m(w,\rho)\\
&\qquad\quad + \ x^{-1}\Big(\left(\frac{j-m}{j+1}\right)\alpha_0^{\frac{1}{2}}\mathcal{M}_{j-\frac{1}{2}}+\varphi\frac{(j-m)}{2}\mathcal{A}_j\Big)G_{m+\frac{1}{2}}(w,\rho)\bigg)\Bigg)\cdot(w,\rho)
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
= \ & \exp\Big((\tilde{x}-\alpha_0^{-1}x)L_{-1}(w,\rho)+(\tilde{\varphi}-\alpha_0^{-\frac{1}{2}}\varphi)G_{-\frac{1}{2}}(w,\rho)\Big)\cdot\\
&\exp\Bigg(-\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}\Big(\Theta_j^{(1)}L_j(w,\rho)+\Theta_{j-\frac{1}{2}}^{(1)}G_{j-\frac{1}{2}}(w,\rho)\Big)\Bigg)\cdot\exp\Big(-\Theta_0^{(1)}2L_0(w,\rho)\Big)\cdot(w,\rho).
\end{aligned}
$$

By Proposition 3.12, this equality implies (3.76). □

Let

$$(\tilde{x},\tilde{\varphi})=(H^{(2)}_{\mathcal{B},\mathcal{N}})^{-1}\circ I(x,\varphi)\in(x,\varphi)+\mathbb{C}[x^{-1},\varphi][[\mathcal{B}]][\mathcal{N}].$$

Let w be another even formal variable and ρ another odd formal variable. Now write $s_{(x,\varphi)}(w,\rho) = (-x + w - \rho\varphi, \rho - \varphi)$. We will use the convention that we should expand $(-x + w - \rho\varphi)^j = (-x + w)^j - j\rho\varphi(-x + w)^{j-1}$ in positive powers of the second even variable w, for $j \in \mathbb{Z}$ (cf. [**FLM**], [**FHL**]). Then

$$s_{(x,\varphi)} \circ I^{-1} \circ H^{(2)}_{\mathcal{B},\mathcal{N}} \circ s^{-1}_{(\tilde{x},\tilde{\varphi})}(w,\rho) \in w\mathbb{C}[x^{-1},\varphi][[\mathcal{B}]][\mathcal{N}][[w]] \oplus \rho\mathbb{C}[x^{-1},\varphi][[\mathcal{B}]][\mathcal{N}][[w]],$$

is superconformal in (w,ρ), (i.e., letting $D = \frac{\partial}{\partial\rho} + \rho\frac{\partial}{\partial w}$, then $D\tilde{w} = \tilde{\rho}D\tilde{\rho}$ for $(\tilde{w},\tilde{\rho}) = s_{(x,\varphi)} \circ I^{-1} \circ H^{(2)}_{\mathcal{B},\mathcal{N}} \circ s^{-1}_{(\tilde{x},\tilde{\varphi})}(w,\rho)$), and the even coefficient of the monomial ρ is an element in $1 + x^{-1}\mathbb{C}[x^{-1},\varphi][[\mathcal{B}]][\mathcal{N}]$.

Let

$$\Theta^{(2)}_j = \Theta^{(2)}_j(\mathcal{B},\mathcal{N},(x,\varphi)) \in \mathbb{C}[x^{-1},\varphi][[\mathcal{B}]][\mathcal{N}],$$

for $j \in \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{N}$, be defined by

$$\begin{aligned} &\left(\exp(\Theta^{(2)}_0(\mathcal{B},\mathcal{N},(x,\varphi)), \left\{\Theta^{(2)}_j(\mathcal{B},\mathcal{N},(x,\varphi)), \Theta^{(2)}_{j-\frac{1}{2}}(\mathcal{B},\mathcal{N},(x,\varphi))\right\}_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}\right) \\ &\quad = \hat{E}^{-1}(s_{(x,\varphi)} \circ I^{-1} \circ H^{(2)}_{\mathcal{B},\mathcal{N}} \circ s^{-1}_{(\tilde{x},\tilde{\varphi})}(w,\rho)). \end{aligned} \tag{3.77}$$

In other words, the $\Theta^{(2)}_j$'s are determined uniquely by

$$\begin{aligned} &s_{(x,\varphi)} \circ I^{-1} \circ H^{(2)}_{\mathcal{B},\mathcal{N}} \circ s^{-1}_{(\tilde{x},\tilde{\varphi})}(w,\rho) \\ &\quad = \exp\left(-\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}\left(\Theta^{(2)}_j L_j(w,\rho) + \Theta^{(2)}_{j-\frac{1}{2}} G_{j-\frac{1}{2}}(w,\rho)\right)\right)\cdot \\ &\qquad\qquad\qquad \exp\left(-\Theta^{(2)}_0 2L_0(w,\rho)\right)\cdot(w,\rho) \\ &\quad = \exp\left(\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}\left(\Theta^{(2)}_j\left(w^{j+1}\frac{\partial}{\partial w} + \left(\frac{j+1}{2}\right)\rho w^j\frac{\partial}{\partial\rho}\right) + \Theta^{(2)}_{j-\frac{1}{2}} w^j\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial\rho} - \rho\frac{\partial}{\partial w}\right)\right)\right)\cdot \\ &\qquad\qquad\qquad \exp\left(\Theta^{(2)}_0\left(2w\frac{\partial}{\partial w} + \rho\frac{\partial}{\partial\rho}\right)\right)\cdot(w,\rho). \end{aligned}$$

This formal power series in (w,ρ) gives the formal local superconformal coordinate at a puncture of the canonical supersphere obtained from the sewing together of two particular canonical superspheres with punctures. Specifically, this is the formal power series giving the resulting local coordinate at the 1-st puncture, given formally by $H^{(2)}_{\mathcal{B},\mathcal{N}} \circ I(x,\varphi)$, of the supersphere $S_1\ {}_2\infty_0\ S_2$ with $1+2$ tubes obtained by sewing a supersphere S_2 with $1+1$ tubes to the 2-nd puncture of the supersphere S_1 with $1+2$ punctures given by

$$S_1 = ((z,\theta); I(w,\rho), s_{(z,\theta)}(w,\rho), (w,\rho))$$

where the local coordinate vanishing at the puncture at ∞ of S_2 is given formally by $H^{(2)}_{\mathcal{B},\mathcal{N}}(w,\rho)$ and where $(x,\varphi) = (z,\theta)$.

PROPOSITION 3.31. *In the* $\mathbb{C}[x^{-1},\varphi][[\mathcal{B}]][\mathcal{N}]$*-envelope of* $\mathrm{End}\ \mathbb{C}[w,w^{-1},\rho]$*, i.e., in the algebra*

$$((\mathrm{End}\ \mathbb{C}[w,w^{-1},\rho])[x^{-1},\varphi][[\mathcal{B}]][\mathcal{N}])^0 \subset (\mathrm{End}\ \mathbb{C}[w,w^{-1},\rho][x^{-1},\varphi][[\mathcal{B}]][\mathcal{N}])^0,$$

the following identity holds.

$$\exp\Biggl(\sum_{m=-1}^{\infty}\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}\binom{-j+1}{m+1}x^{-j-m}\biggl(\Bigl(\mathcal{B}_j+2\varphi\mathcal{N}_{j-\frac{1}{2}}\Bigr)L_m(w,\rho) + \Bigl(\mathcal{N}_{j-\frac{1}{2}}+\varphi x^{-1}\frac{(-j-m)}{2}\mathcal{B}_j\Bigr)G_{m+\frac{1}{2}}(w,\rho)\biggr)\Biggr) \tag{3.78}$$

$$= \exp\Bigl((\tilde{x}-x)L_{-1}(w,\rho)+(\tilde{\varphi}-\varphi)G_{-\frac{1}{2}}(w,\rho)\Bigr)\cdot \exp\Biggl(-\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}\biggl(\Theta_j^{(2)}L_j(w,\rho)+\Theta_{j-\frac{1}{2}}^{(2)}G_{j-\frac{1}{2}}(w,\rho)\biggr)\Biggr)\cdot\exp\Bigl(-\Theta_0^{(2)}2L_0(w,\rho)\Bigr),$$

for $(\tilde{x},\tilde{\varphi}) = (H^{(2)}_{\mathcal{B},\mathcal{N}})^{-1}\circ I(x,\varphi)$.

PROOF. By Taylor's theorem

$$\begin{aligned}
&s_{(x,\varphi)}\circ I^{-1}\circ H^{(2)}_{\mathcal{B},\mathcal{N}}\circ s^{-1}_{(x,\varphi)}(w,\rho)\\
&\quad= s_{(x,\varphi)}\circ I^{-1}\circ H^{(2)}_{\mathcal{B},\mathcal{N}}(w+x+\rho\varphi,\rho+\varphi)\\
&\quad= s_{(x,\varphi)}\circ I^{-1}\circ H^{(2)}_{\mathcal{B},\mathcal{N}}(w+\tilde{x}+\rho\tilde{\varphi}+(x-\tilde{x})+\rho(\varphi-\tilde{\varphi}),\rho+\tilde{\varphi}+(\varphi-\tilde{\varphi}))\\
&\quad= \exp\Bigl(-(\tilde{x}-x)\frac{\partial}{\partial w}-(\tilde{\varphi}-\varphi)\Bigl(\frac{\partial}{\partial\rho}-\rho\frac{\partial}{\partial w}\Bigr)\Bigr)\cdot\\
&\qquad\qquad s_{(x,\varphi)}\circ I^{-1}\circ H^{(2)}_{\mathcal{B},\mathcal{N}}(w+\tilde{x}+\rho\tilde{\varphi},\rho+\tilde{\varphi})\\
&\quad= \exp\Bigl((\tilde{x}-x)L_{-1}(w,\rho)+(\tilde{\varphi}-\varphi)G_{-\frac{1}{2}}(w,\rho)\Bigr)\cdot\\
&\qquad\qquad s_{(x,\varphi)}\circ I^{-1}\circ H^{(2)}_{\mathcal{B},\mathcal{N}}\circ s^{-1}_{(\tilde{x},\tilde{\varphi})}(w,\rho)\\
&\quad= \exp\Bigl((\tilde{x}-x)L_{-1}(w,\rho)+(\tilde{\varphi}-\varphi)G_{-\frac{1}{2}}(w,\rho)\Bigr)\cdot\\
&\qquad\qquad \exp\Biggl(-\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}\biggl(\Theta_j^{(2)}L_j(w,\rho)+\Theta_{j-\frac{1}{2}}^{(2)}G_{j-\frac{1}{2}}(w,\rho)\biggr)\Biggr)\cdot\\
&\qquad\qquad \exp\Bigl(-\Theta_0^{(2)}2L_0(w,\rho)\Bigr)\cdot(w,\rho).
\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, since

$$I^{-1}\circ H^{(2)}_{\mathcal{B},\mathcal{N}}(w,\rho) = \exp\Biggl(\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}\biggl(\mathcal{B}_jL_{-j}(w,\rho)+\mathcal{N}_{j-\frac{1}{2}}G_{-j+\frac{1}{2}}(w,\rho)\biggr)\Biggr)\cdot(w,\rho),$$

by Proposition 3.20, we have

$$s_{(x,\varphi)}\circ I^{-1}\circ H^{(2)}_{\mathcal{B},\mathcal{N}}\circ s^{-1}_{(x,\varphi)}(w,\rho)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
= \ s_{(x,\varphi)}\Bigg(\exp\Bigg(-\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}\Bigg(&\mathcal{B}_j\Big((x+w+\rho\varphi)^{-j+1}\frac{\partial}{\partial(x+w+\rho\varphi)}\\
&+\frac{(-j+1)}{2}(\rho+\varphi)(x+w+\rho\varphi)^{-j}\frac{\partial}{\partial(\rho+\varphi)}\Big)\\
&+\mathcal{N}_{j-\frac{1}{2}}(x+w+\rho\varphi)^{-j+1}\Big(\frac{\partial}{\partial(\rho+\varphi)}-(\rho+\varphi)\frac{\partial}{\partial(x+w+\rho\varphi)}\Big)\Bigg)\Bigg)\cdot\\
&\qquad\qquad (x+w+\rho\varphi,\rho+\varphi)\Bigg)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
= \ s_{(x,\varphi)}\Bigg(\exp\Bigg(-\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}\Bigg(&\mathcal{B}_j\Big((x+w+\rho\varphi)^{-j+1}\frac{\partial}{\partial w}\\
&+\frac{(-j+1)}{2}(\rho+\varphi)(x+w)^{-j}\Big(\frac{\partial}{\partial\rho}-\varphi\frac{\partial}{\partial w}\Big)\Big)\\
&+\mathcal{N}_{j-\frac{1}{2}}(x+w+\rho\varphi)^{-j+1}\Big(\Big(\frac{\partial}{\partial\rho}-\varphi\frac{\partial}{\partial w}\Big)-(\rho+\varphi)\frac{\partial}{\partial w}\Big)\Bigg)\Bigg)\cdot\\
&\qquad\qquad (x+w+\rho\varphi,\rho+\varphi)\Bigg)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
= \ \exp\Bigg(-\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}\Bigg(&\mathcal{B}_j\Big((x+w+\rho\varphi)^{-j+1}\frac{\partial}{\partial w}\\
&+\frac{(-j+1)}{2}(\rho+\varphi)(x+w)^{-j}\Big(\frac{\partial}{\partial\rho}-\varphi\frac{\partial}{\partial w}\Big)\Big)\\
&+\mathcal{N}_{j-\frac{1}{2}}(x+w+\rho\varphi)^{-j+1}\Big(\frac{\partial}{\partial\rho}-(\rho+2\varphi)\frac{\partial}{\partial w}\Big)\Bigg)\Bigg)\cdot(w,\rho)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
= \ \exp\Bigg(-\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}\sum_{m\in\mathbb{N}}\Bigg(&\mathcal{B}_j\Big(\binom{-j+1}{m}x^{-j-m+1}w^m\frac{\partial}{\partial w}\\
&+(-j+1)\binom{-j}{m}\rho\varphi x^{-j-m}w^m\frac{\partial}{\partial w}+\frac{(-j+1)}{2}\binom{-j}{m}(\rho+\varphi)x^{-j-m}w^m\frac{\partial}{\partial\rho}\\
&-\frac{(-j+1)}{2}\binom{-j}{m}\rho\varphi x^{-j-m}w^m\frac{\partial}{\partial w}\Big)\\
&+\mathcal{N}_{j-\frac{1}{2}}\Big(\binom{-j+1}{m}x^{-j-m+1}w^m\frac{\partial}{\partial\rho}+(-j+1)\binom{-j}{m}\rho\varphi x^{-j-m}w^m\frac{\partial}{\partial\rho}\\
&-(\rho+2\varphi)\binom{-j+1}{m}x^{-j-m+1}w^m\frac{\partial}{\partial w}\Big)\Bigg)\Bigg)\cdot(w,\rho)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} = \exp\Bigg(-\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}\sum_{m=-1}^{\infty}\Bigg(&\binom{-j+1}{m+1}x^{-j-m}(\mathcal{B}_j+2\varphi\mathcal{N}_{j-\frac{1}{2}})w^{m+1}\frac{\partial}{\partial w}\\ &+\binom{-j+1}{m+1}x^{-j-m}(\mathcal{B}_j+2\varphi\mathcal{N}_{j-\frac{1}{2}})\frac{(m+1)}{2}\rho w^m\frac{\partial}{\partial \rho}\\ &+\binom{-j+1}{m+1}x^{-j-m}\Big(\mathcal{N}_{j-\frac{1}{2}}+\varphi x^{-1}\frac{(-j-m)}{2}\mathcal{B}_j\Big)w^{m+1}\frac{\partial}{\partial \rho}\\ &-\binom{-j+1}{m+1}x^{-j-m}\Big(\mathcal{N}_{j-\frac{1}{2}}+\varphi x^{-1}\frac{(-j-m)}{2}\mathcal{B}_j\Big)\rho w^{m+1}\frac{\partial}{\partial w}\Bigg)\Bigg)\cdot(w,\rho).\end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned}&\exp\Bigg(\sum_{m=-1}^{\infty}\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}\binom{-j+1}{m+1}x^{-j-m}\Bigg(\Big(\mathcal{B}_j+2\varphi\mathcal{N}_{j-\frac{1}{2}}\Big)L_m(w,\rho)\\ &\qquad\qquad+\Big(\mathcal{N}_{j-\frac{1}{2}}+\varphi x^{-1}\frac{(-j-m)}{2}\mathcal{B}_j\Big)G_{m+\frac{1}{2}}(w,\rho)\Bigg)\Bigg)\cdot(w,\rho)\\ &= \exp\Big((\tilde{x}-x)L_{-1}(w,\rho)+(\tilde{\varphi}-\varphi)G_{-\frac{1}{2}}(w,\rho)\Big)\cdot\\ &\exp\Bigg(-\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}\Big(\Theta_j^{(2)}L_j(w,\rho)+\Theta_{j-\frac{1}{2}}^{(2)}G_{j-\frac{1}{2}}(w,\rho)\Big)\Bigg)\cdot\exp\Big(-\Theta_0^{(2)}2L_0(w,\rho)\Big)\cdot(w,\rho).\end{aligned}$$

By Proposition 3.12, this equality implies (3.76). □

3.4. The $N=1$ Neveu-Schwarz algebra and a representation in terms of superderivations

Let $\mathfrak{v}$ denote the Virasoro algebra with central charge d, basis consisting of the central element d and L_n, for $n\in\mathbb{Z}$, and commutation relations

$$[L_m,L_n]=(m-n)L_{m+n}+\frac{1}{12}(m^3-m)\delta_{m+n,0}\,d, \tag{3.79}$$

for $m,n\in\mathbb{Z}$. Consider the $N=1$ Neveu-Schwarz Lie superalgebra $\mathfrak{ns}$ which is a super-extension of $\mathfrak{v}$ by the odd elements $G_{n+1/2}$, for $n\in\mathbb{Z}$, such that $\mathfrak{ns}$ has a basis consisting of the central element d, L_n, and $G_{n+1/2}$, for $n\in\mathbb{Z}$, with supercommutation relations

$$\big[G_{m+\frac{1}{2}},L_n\big] = \Big(m-\frac{n-1}{2}\Big)G_{m+n+\frac{1}{2}} \tag{3.80}$$

$$\big[G_{m+\frac{1}{2}},G_{n-\frac{1}{2}}\big] = 2L_{m+n}+\frac{1}{3}(m^2+m)\delta_{m+n,0}\,d \tag{3.81}$$

in addition to (3.79).

It is easy to check that the superderivations in $\mathrm{Der}(\mathbb{C}[x,x^{-1},\varphi])$ given by (3.9) and (3.10), i.e., the superderivations

$$L_n(x,\varphi) = -\Big(x^{n+1}\frac{\partial}{\partial x}+\Big(\frac{n+1}{2}\Big)\varphi x^n\frac{\partial}{\partial\varphi}\Big) \tag{3.82}$$

$$G_{n-\frac{1}{2}}(x,\varphi) = -x^n\Big(\frac{\partial}{\partial\varphi}-\varphi\frac{\partial}{\partial x}\Big) \tag{3.83}$$

for $n \in \mathbb{Z}$, satisfy the $N = 1$ Neveu-Schwarz relations (3.79) - (3.81) with central charge zero (cf. [**Bc2**]).

Let W be a $\mathbb{Z}_2$-graded vector space over $\mathbb{C}$ such that $\dim W^1 = 1$ and $\dim W^0 = 2$. Recall the classical Lie superalgebra $\mathfrak{osp}_{\mathbb{C}}(1|2)$ (cf. [**K**]) the orthogonal-symplectic superalgebra

$$\mathfrak{osp}_{\mathbb{C}}(1|2) = \left\{ \left(\begin{array}{ccc} 0 & p & q \\ q & a & b \\ -p & c & -a \end{array} \right) \in \mathfrak{gl}_{\mathbb{C}}(1|2) \;\middle|\; a, b, c, d, p, q \in \mathbb{C} \right\}$$

which is the subalgebra of $\mathfrak{gl}_{\mathbb{C}}(1|2)$ leaving the non-degenerate form β on W given by $\left(\begin{array}{ccc} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 \end{array} \right)$ invariant, meaning $\beta(Xu, v) + (-1)^{\eta(X)\eta(u)}\beta(u, Xv) = 0$ for $X \in \mathfrak{gl}_{\mathbb{C}}(1|2)$, $u, v \in W$, and X and u homogeneous. The subalgebra of $\mathfrak{ns}$ given by $\mathrm{span}_{\mathbb{C}}\{L_{\pm 1}, L_0, G_{\pm 1/2}\}$ is isomorphic to $\mathfrak{osp}_{\mathbb{C}}(1|2)$. The correspondence

$$\begin{array}{rcl}
\left(\begin{array}{ccc} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{array} \right) & \longleftrightarrow & -\dfrac{\partial}{\partial x}, \\
\dfrac{1}{2}\left(\begin{array}{ccc} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 \end{array} \right) & \longleftrightarrow & -\left(x\dfrac{\partial}{\partial x} + \dfrac{1}{2}\varphi\dfrac{\partial}{\partial \varphi} \right), \\
\left(\begin{array}{ccc} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 \end{array} \right) & \longleftrightarrow & -\left(x^2\dfrac{\partial}{\partial x} + \varphi x\dfrac{\partial}{\partial \varphi} \right), \\
\left(\begin{array}{ccc} 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{array} \right) & \longleftrightarrow & -\left(\dfrac{\partial}{\partial \varphi} - \varphi\dfrac{\partial}{\partial x} \right), \\
\left(\begin{array}{ccc} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 \end{array} \right) & \longleftrightarrow & -x\left(\dfrac{\partial}{\partial \varphi} - \varphi\dfrac{\partial}{\partial x} \right),
\end{array}$$

defines a Lie superalgebra isomorphism between $\mathfrak{osp}_{\mathbb{C}}(1|2)$ and the Lie superalgebra generated by $L_{\pm 1}(x, \varphi), L_0(x, \varphi), G_{\pm 1/2}(x, \varphi)$. Let y be an even formal variable and ξ an odd formal variable. Letting X denote each of the five matrices above, we observe that

$$e^{-yX} = \left(\begin{array}{ccc} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & -y \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{array} \right), \quad \left(\begin{array}{ccc} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & e^{-\frac{y}{2}} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & e^{\frac{y}{2}} \end{array} \right), \quad \left(\begin{array}{ccc} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & y & 1 \end{array} \right)$$

$$e^{-\xi X} = \left(\begin{array}{ccc} 1 & 0 & -\xi \\ -\xi & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{array} \right), \quad \left(\begin{array}{ccc} 1 & -\xi & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ \xi & 0 & 1 \end{array} \right),$$

respectively. These are all elements in the connected component of the Lie supergroup $OSP(1|2)$ containing the identity with matrix elements in $\mathbb{C}[[y]][\xi]$, and hence have superdeterminant 1, where the superdeterminant is defined as

$$\mathrm{sdet} \left(\begin{array}{cc} A & B \\ C & D \end{array} \right) = \det(A - BD^{-1}C)(\det D)^{-1}$$

(cf. [**D**], [**CR**]). (In our case, A is a one-by-one matrix, B is two-by-one, C is one-by-two, and D is two-by-two.) In fact, for R a superalgebra with $y \in R^0$ and $\xi \in R^1$, the five matrices above generate the connected component of $OSP_R(1|2)$ containing the identity. Denote this group by G.

G acts on an even and an odd formal variable by the superprojective transformations, i.e, for $g = e^{-yX}$ and $g = e^{-\xi X}$ above, we have

$$g \cdot (x, \varphi) = (x + y, \varphi), \quad (e^y x, e^{\frac{y}{2}} \varphi), \quad \Big(\frac{x}{1 - yx}, \varphi \frac{1}{1 - yx}\Big) \tag{3.84}$$

$$(x + \varphi\xi, \xi + \varphi), \quad (x + \varphi\xi x, \xi x + \varphi),$$

respectively. These generate the supergroup of superprojective transformations which is the group of global superconformal automorphisms of the super-Riemann sphere studied in Chapter 2.

Thus, $\mathfrak{osp}_{\mathbb{C}}(1|2)$ is the superalgebra of infinitesimal superprojective transformations. Note that for the representative elements $L(\pm 1), L(0), G(\pm 1/2)$, we have

$$\begin{array}{rcl} e^{-yL(-1)} \cdot (x, \varphi) & = & (x + y, \varphi), \\ e^{-yL(0)} \cdot (x, \varphi) & = & (e^y x, e^{\frac{y}{2}} \varphi), \\ e^{-yL(1)} \cdot (x, \varphi) & = & \Big(\frac{x}{1 - yx}, \varphi \frac{1}{1 - yx}\Big), \\ e^{-\xi G(-\frac{1}{2})} \cdot (x, \varphi) & = & (x + \varphi\xi, \xi + \varphi), \\ e^{-\xi G(\frac{1}{2})} \cdot (x, \varphi) & = & (x + \varphi\xi x, \xi x + \varphi), \end{array}$$

as expected.

3.5. Modules for the $N = 1$ Neveu-Schwarz algebra

Let $\mathfrak{ns}$ denote the $N = 1$ Neveu-Schwarz algebra defined above. For any representation of $\mathfrak{ns}$, we shall use $L(m)$, $G(m - 1/2)$ and $c \in \mathbb{C}$ to denote the representation images of L_m, $G_{m-1/2}$ and d, respectively. We can think of the identities proved in Section 3.3 as identities for the representation of $\mathfrak{ns}$ given by (3.82), (3.83) and $c = 0$. We want to prove the corresponding identities for any representation of $\mathfrak{ns}$ and then we will want to prove additional properties related to these identities for certain representations of $\mathfrak{ns}$. We do this by first proving the identities in a certain extension of the universal enveloping algebra of $\mathfrak{ns}$. This extension must be one such that terms such as $(t^{1/2})^{kL_0}$, for any formal variable $t^{1/2}$ and $k \in 2\mathbb{Z} \smallsetminus \{0\}$, can be well defined.

Consider the two subalgebras of $\mathfrak{ns}$

$$\begin{array}{rcl} \mathfrak{ns}_+ & = & \displaystyle\bigoplus_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_+} \mathbb{C} L_n \oplus \bigoplus_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_+} \mathbb{C} G_{n - \frac{1}{2}}, \\ \mathfrak{ns}_- & = & \displaystyle\bigoplus_{-n \in \mathbb{Z}_+} \mathbb{C} L_n \oplus \bigoplus_{-n \in \mathbb{Z}_+} \mathbb{C} G_{n + \frac{1}{2}}. \end{array}$$

Let $U(\mathfrak{ns}_-)$ be the universal enveloping algebra of the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{ns}_-$. For any $h, c \in \mathbb{C}$, the Verma module $M(c, h)$ (cf. [**KW**]) for $\mathfrak{ns}$ is a free $U(\mathfrak{ns}_-)$-module generated by an element $\mathbf{1}_{c,h}$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{ns}_+\mathbf{1}_{c,h} &= 0, \\ L(0)\mathbf{1}_{c,h} &= h\mathbf{1}_{c,h}, \\ d\mathbf{1}_{c,h} &= c\mathbf{1}_{c,h}. \end{aligned}$$

Let

$$V = \coprod_{n\in\frac{1}{2}\mathbb{Z}} V_{(n)} \tag{3.85}$$

be a module for $\mathfrak{ns}$ of central charge $c \in \mathbb{C}$ (i.e., $dv = cv$ for $v \in V$) such that for $v \in V_{(n)}$,

$$L(0)v = nv. \tag{3.86}$$

Let $P(n)$ be the projection from V to $V_{(n)}$. For any formal variable $t^{1/2}$ and $k \in 2\mathbb{Z} \smallsetminus \{0\}$, we define $(t^{1/2})^{kL(0)} \in (\mathrm{End}V)[[t^{1/2}, t^{-1/2}]]$ by

$$(t^{\frac{1}{2}})^{kL(0)}v = (t^{\frac{1}{2}})^{kn}v$$

for $v \in V_{(n)}$, or equivalently

$$(t^{\frac{1}{2}})^{kL(0)}v = \sum_{n\in\frac{1}{2}\mathbb{Z}} P(n)(t^{\frac{1}{2}})^{kn}v$$

for any $v \in V$.

Let V_P be a vector space over $\mathbb{C}$ with basis $\{P_n \mid n \in \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{Z}\}$. Let $T(\mathfrak{ns} \oplus V_P)$ be the tensor algebra generated by the direct sum of $\mathfrak{ns}$ and V_P, and let $\mathcal{I}$ be the ideal of $T(\mathfrak{ns} \oplus V_P)$ generated by

$$\begin{aligned} \Big\{ & L_n \otimes L_m - L_m \otimes L_n - [L_n, L_m],\ L_m \otimes G_{n-\frac{1}{2}} - G_{n-\frac{1}{2}} \otimes L_m - \big[L_m, G_{n-\frac{1}{2}}\big], \\ & G_{n+\frac{1}{2}} \otimes G_{m-\frac{1}{2}} + G_{m-\frac{1}{2}} \otimes G_{n+\frac{1}{2}} - \big[G_{n+\frac{1}{2}}, G_{m-\frac{1}{2}}\big],\ L_n \otimes d - d \otimes L_n, \\ & G_{m-\frac{1}{2}} \otimes d - d \otimes G_{m-\frac{1}{2}},\ P_i \otimes P_j - \delta_{i,j}P_i,\ P_i \otimes L_m - L_m \otimes P_{i+m}, \\ & P_i \otimes G_{m-\frac{1}{2}} - G_{m-\frac{1}{2}} \otimes P_{i+m-\frac{1}{2}},\ P_i \otimes d - d \otimes P_i \ \Big|\ m, n \in \mathbb{Z},\ i, j \in \tfrac{1}{2}\mathbb{Z}\Big\}. \end{aligned}$$

Then $U_P(\mathfrak{ns}) = T(\mathfrak{ns} \oplus V_P)/\mathcal{I}$ is an associative superalgebra and the universal enveloping algebra $U(\mathfrak{ns})$ of the Neveu-Schwarz algebra is a subalgebra. Linearly $U_P(\mathfrak{ns}) = U(\mathfrak{ns}) \otimes V_P$.

For any even formal variable $t^{1/2}$ and $k \in 2\mathbb{Z} \smallsetminus \{0\}$, we define

$$(t^{\frac{1}{2}})^{kL_0} = \sum_{n\in\frac{1}{2}\mathbb{Z}} P_n(t^{\frac{1}{2}})^{kn} \ \in\ U_P(\mathfrak{ns})[[t^{\frac{1}{2}}, t^{-\frac{1}{2}}]].$$

Then for $k, n \in 2\mathbb{Z} \smallsetminus \{0\}$, and $m \in \mathbb{Z}$,

$$\begin{aligned} (t^{\frac{1}{2}})^{kL_0}(t^{\frac{1}{2}})^{nL_0} &= (t^{\frac{1}{2}})^{(k+n)L_0}, \\ (t^{\frac{1}{2}})^{kL_0}L_m &= L_m(t^{\frac{1}{2}})^{-km}(t^{\frac{1}{2}})^{kL_0}, \\ (t^{\frac{1}{2}})^{kL_0}G_{m-\frac{1}{2}} &= G_{m-\frac{1}{2}}(t^{\frac{1}{2}})^{-k(m-\frac{1}{2})}t^{kL_0}, \end{aligned}$$

and $(t^{1/2})^{kL_0}$ commutes with d.

The following proposition is proved similarly to that for the universal enveloping algebra of a Lie algebra.

Proposition 3.32. *Let V be a module for $\mathfrak{ns}$ of the form (3.85) such that (3.86) holds. Then there is a unique algebra homomorphism from $U_P(\mathfrak{ns})$ to End V such that L_j, $G_{j-1/2}$, d and P_n are mapped to $L(j)$, $G(j-1/2)$, c and $P(n)$, respectively, for $j \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $n \in \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{Z}$.*

If

$$V_{(n)} = 0 \quad \text{for } n \text{ sufficiently small,}$$

then we say that V is a *positive energy module* for the Neveu-Schwarz algebra and that the corresponding representation is a *positive energy representation* of the Neveu-Schwarz algebra.

The Verma module $M(c,h)$ with central charge $c \in \mathbb{C}$ generated from a lowest weight vector $\mathbf{1}_{c,h}$ with weight $h \in \mathbb{Z}$ is an example of a positive energy representation of the Neveu-Schwarz algebra as is an $N = 1$ vertex operator superalgebra (see [**KW**], [**B3**]).

3.6. Realizations of the sewing identities for general representations of the $N = 1$ Neveu-Schwarz algebra

As mentioned before, the identities proved in Section 3.3 can be thought of as identities for the representation of the Neveu-Schwarz algebra on $\mathbb{C}[x, x^{-1}, \varphi]$ given by (3.82), (3.83) and $c = 0$. We now want to prove the corresponding identities for any representation of the $N = 1$ Neveu-Schwarz algebra. Since in general, the central charge c will not be zero, we will have an extra term in these identities involving c. We first prove the identities for $U_P(\mathfrak{ns})$ defined in Section 3.5.

Proposition 3.33. *Let $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ be two sequences of even formal variables, $\mathcal{M}$ and $\mathcal{N}$ two sequences of odd formal variables, $\alpha_0^{1/2}$ another even formal variable, and $(\Psi_j, \Psi_{j-1/2})$, for $j \in \mathbb{Z}$, the canonical sequence of formal series given by Proposition 3.28. There exists a unique canonical formal series*

$$\Gamma = \Gamma(\alpha_0^{\frac{1}{2}}, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{M}, \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{N}) \in (\mathbb{C}[\alpha_0^{\frac{1}{2}}, \alpha_0^{-\frac{1}{2}}][[\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}]][\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N}])^0$$

such that

$$\Gamma = \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}_+} \left(\left(\frac{j^3 - j}{12} \right) \alpha_0^{-j} \mathcal{A}_j \mathcal{B}_j + \left(\frac{j^2 - j}{3} \right) \alpha_0^{-j+\frac{1}{2}} \mathcal{N}_{j-\frac{1}{2}} \mathcal{M}_{j-\frac{1}{2}} \right) + \Gamma_0 \tag{3.87}$$

where Γ_0 contains only terms with total degree at least three in the $\mathcal{A}_j$'s, $\mathcal{M}_{j-1/2}$'s, $\mathcal{B}_j$'s, and $\mathcal{N}_{j-1/2}$'s for $j \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ with each term containing at least one of the $\mathcal{A}_j$'s or $\mathcal{M}_{j-1/2}$'s and at least one of the $\mathcal{B}_j$'s or $\mathcal{N}_{j-1/2}$'s such that in [6]

$$(U_P(\mathfrak{ns})[\alpha_0^{\frac{1}{2}}, \alpha_0^{-\frac{1}{2}}][[\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}]][\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N}])^0,$$

i.e., in the $\mathbb{C}[\alpha_0^{1/2}, \alpha_0^{-1/2}][[\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}]][\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N}]$-envelope of $U_P(\mathfrak{ns})$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &e^{-\sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}_+} (\mathcal{A}_j L_j + \mathcal{M}_{j-\frac{1}{2}} G_{j-\frac{1}{2}})} \, (\alpha_0^{\frac{1}{2}})^{-2L_0} \, e^{-\sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}_+} (\mathcal{B}_j L_{-j} + \mathcal{N}_{j-\frac{1}{2}} G_{-j+\frac{1}{2}})} \\ &\quad = e^{\sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}_+} (\Psi_{-j} L_{-j} + \Psi_{-j+\frac{1}{2}} G_{-j+\frac{1}{2}})} \, e^{\sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}_+} (\Psi_j L_j + \Psi_{j-\frac{1}{2}} G_{j-\frac{1}{2}})} \, e^{2\Psi_0 L_0} \, (\alpha_0^{\frac{1}{2}})^{-2L_0} \, e^{\Gamma c}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.88}$$

---

[6] There is a misprint in the analogous nonsuper case to this proposition given in [**H2**]. In Proposition 4.2.1 in [**H2**], the equality (4.2.2) (which is the nonsuper part of formula (3.88)) takes place in $\mathcal{R}_\Pi = U_\Pi(\mathfrak{L})[\alpha_0, \alpha_0^{-1}][[\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}]]$, not $\mathcal{R} = U(\mathfrak{L})[\alpha_0, \alpha_0^{-1}][[\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}]]$ as stated. Huang's $\mathcal{R}_\Pi$ is equivalent to our $U_P(\mathfrak{v})[\alpha_0, \alpha_0^{-1}][[\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}]] \subset (U_P(\mathfrak{ns})[\alpha_0^{1/2}, \alpha_0^{-1/2}][[\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}]][\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N}])^0$.

PROOF. We use Huang's proof of Proposition 4.2.1 in [**H2**] generalized to the present situation. The idea is to use the Campbell-Baker-Hausdorff formula and compare the result with (3.71). However one must first establish the appropriate algebraic setting in which the Campbell-Baker-Hausdorff formula holds rigorously. Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a sequence of even formal variables, $\mathcal{O}$ a sequence of odd formal variables and $\mathcal{C}_0$ another even formal variable. Let $\mathcal{W}$ be the $\mathbb{Z}_2$-graded vector space $\mathfrak{ns}[\alpha_0^{1/2}, \alpha_0^{-1/2}][[\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{C}, \mathcal{C}_0]][\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N}, \mathcal{O}]$. Consider the subspace $\mathcal{V}$ spanned by the elements

$$L_{\mathcal{A}} = - \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}_+} \mathcal{A}_j L_j, \quad L_{\mathcal{B}} = - \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}_+} \alpha_0^{-j} \mathcal{B}_j L_{-j}, \quad L_{\mathcal{C}} = - \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}_+} \mathcal{C}_j L_j,$$

$$L_{\mathcal{C}_0} = - \, \mathcal{C}_0 L_0, \quad L_{\mathcal{M}} = - \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}_+} \mathcal{M}_{j - \frac{1}{2}} G_{j - \frac{1}{2}}, \quad L_{\mathcal{N}} = - \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}_+} \alpha_0^{-j + \frac{1}{2}} \mathcal{N}_{j - \frac{1}{2}} G_{-j + \frac{1}{2}},$$

and

$$L_{\mathcal{O}} = - \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}_+} \mathcal{O}_{j - \frac{1}{2}} G_{j - \frac{1}{2}}.$$

Then $\mathcal{V} \subset \mathcal{W}^0$, i.e., $\mathcal{V}$ contains only even elements. In other words, letting $R = \mathbb{Q}[\alpha_0^{1/2}, \alpha_0^{-1/2}][[\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{C}, \mathcal{C}_0]][\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N}, \mathcal{O}]$, then $\mathcal{V}$ is in the R-envelope of $\mathfrak{ns}$ which is a Lie algebra; see Remarks 2.1 and 3.7. Thus the same procedure used to prove Proposition 4.2.1 in [**H2**] is valid for $\mathcal{V}$ where we simply use Proposition 3.28 instead of Huang's Proposition 2.2.5 in [**H2**], and the Neveu-Schwarz algebra relations and corresponding universal enveloping algebra instead of just the Virasoro algebra relations and corresponding universal enveloping algebra. ☐

REMARK 3.34. Note that we used Proposition 3.28 to prove Proposition 3.33 above. In [**BHL**], we give a more straightforward and Lie-theoretic proof of Proposition 3.33 by proving a certain bijectivity property for the Campbell-Baker-Hausdorff formula in the theory of Lie algebras. This allows us to prove Proposition 3.33 directly for the Neveu-Schwarz algebra rather than go through the representation in terms of superderivations and then lift to the Lie algebra as we have done above.

Let $V = \coprod_{n \in \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{Z}} V_{(n)}$ be a module for the Neveu-Schwarz algebra, and let $L(j), G(j - 1/2) \in \mathrm{End}\, V$ and $c \in \mathbb{C}$ be the representation images of L_j, $G_{j-1/2}$ and d, respectively, such that for $v \in V_{(n)}$, $L(0)v = nv$. Combining Propositions 3.32 and 3.33, we have the following corollary.

COROLLARY 3.35. *In the* $\mathbb{C}[\alpha_0^{1/2}, \alpha_0^{-1/2}][[\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}]][\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N}]$*-envelope of* End V*, i.e., in* $((\mathrm{End}\, V)[\alpha_0^{1/2}, \alpha_0^{-1/2}][[\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}]][\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N}])^0$*, we have*

(3.89)
$$e^{- \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}_+} (\mathcal{A}_j L(j) + \mathcal{M}_{j - \frac{1}{2}} G(j - \frac{1}{2}))} \cdot (\alpha_0^{\frac{1}{2}})^{-2L(0)} \cdot e^{- \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}_+} (\mathcal{B}_j L(-j) + \mathcal{N}_{j - \frac{1}{2}} G(-j + \frac{1}{2}))}$$
$$= e^{\sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}_+} (\Psi_{-j} L(-j) + \Psi_{-j + \frac{1}{2}} G(-j + \frac{1}{2}))} \cdot e^{\sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}_+} (\Psi_j L(j) + \Psi_{j - \frac{1}{2}} G(j - \frac{1}{2}))} \cdot$$
$$\cdot \, e^{2\Psi_0 L(0)} \cdot (\alpha_0^{\frac{1}{2}})^{-2L(0)} \cdot e^{\Gamma c}.$$

We also have the following two propositions and corollaries corresponding to the identities (3.76) and (3.78).

Proposition 3.36. *Let w be another formal even variable and ρ be another formal odd variable, and for $j \in \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{N}$, let $\Theta_j^{(1)} = \Theta_j^{(1)}(\alpha_0^{1/2}, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{M}, (x,\varphi))$ be the sequence of formal series in $\mathbb{C}[x,\varphi][\alpha_0^{1/2}, \alpha_0^{-1/2}][[\mathcal{A}]][\mathcal{M}]$ given by (3.75). Then in $(U(\mathfrak{ns})[x,\varphi][\alpha_0^{1/2}, \alpha_0^{-1/2}][[\mathcal{A}]][\mathcal{M}])^0$, we have*

$$\begin{aligned}\exp\Bigg(-\sum_{m=-1}^{\infty}\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}\binom{j+1}{m+1}\alpha_0^{-j}x^{j-m}\bigg(\Big(\mathcal{A}_j + 2\left(\frac{j-m}{j+1}\right)\alpha_0^{\frac12}x^{-1}\varphi\mathcal{M}_{j-\frac12}\Big)L_m \\ +\ x^{-1}\Big(\left(\frac{j-m}{j+1}\right)\alpha_0^{\frac12}\mathcal{M}_{j-\frac12} + \varphi\frac{(j-m)}{2}\mathcal{A}_j\Big)G_{m+\frac12}\bigg)\Bigg) \\ =\ e^{\left((\tilde{x}-\alpha_0^{-1}x)L_{-1}+(\tilde{\varphi}-\alpha_0^{-1/2}\varphi)G_{-\frac12}\right)}\cdot e^{\left(-\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}\left(\Theta_j^{(1)}L_j+\Theta_{j-\frac12}^{(1)}G_{j-\frac12}\right)\right)}\cdot e^{\left(-2\Theta_0^{(1)}L_0\right)},\end{aligned}$$

where $(\tilde{x},\tilde{\varphi}) = (H^{(1)}_{\alpha_0^{1/2},\mathcal{A},\mathcal{M}})^{-1}(x,\varphi)$ with $H^{(1)}_{\alpha_0^{1/2},\mathcal{A},\mathcal{M}}(x,\varphi)$ given by (3.48).

Proof. The proof is the same as that for Proposition 3.33 except that in this case we only consider the subalgebra with basis L_j, $G_{j+1/2}$, for $j \geq -1$ and use Proposition 3.30 instead of Proposition 3.28. □

From Propositions 3.32 and 3.36, we have the following corollary.

Corollary 3.37. *In $((\mathrm{End}\, V)[x,\varphi][\alpha_0^{1/2}, \alpha_0^{-1/2}][[\mathcal{A}]][\mathcal{M}])^0$, we have*

$$\begin{aligned}\exp\Bigg(-\sum_{m=-1}^{\infty}\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}\binom{j+1}{m+1}\alpha_0^{-j}x^{j-m} \\ \bigg(\Big(\mathcal{A}_j + 2\left(\frac{j-m}{j+1}\right)\alpha_0^{\frac12}x^{-1}\varphi\mathcal{M}_{j-\frac12}\Big)L(m) \\ +\ x^{-1}\Big(\left(\frac{j-m}{j+1}\right)\alpha_0^{\frac12}\mathcal{M}_{j-\frac12} + \varphi\frac{(j-m)}{2}\mathcal{A}_j\Big)G(m+\frac12)\bigg)\Bigg) \\ =\ e^{\left((\tilde{x}-\alpha_0^{-1}x)L(-1)+(\tilde{\varphi}-\alpha_0^{-1/2}\varphi)G(-\frac12)\right)}\cdot e^{\left(-\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}\left(\Theta_j^{(1)}L(j)+\Theta_{j-\frac12}^{(1)}G(j-\frac12)\right)\right)}\cdot \\ \cdot\, e^{\left(-2\Theta_0^{(1)}L(0)\right)}\end{aligned} \tag{3.90}$$

for $(\tilde{x},\tilde{\varphi}) = (H^{(1)}_{\alpha_0^{1/2},\mathcal{A},\mathcal{M}})^{-1}(x,\varphi)$.

Proposition 3.38. *For $j \in \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{N}$, let $\Theta_j^{(2)} = \Theta_j^{(2)}(\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{N}, (x,\varphi))$ be the sequence of formal series in $\mathbb{C}[x^{-1},\varphi][[\mathcal{B}]][\mathcal{N}]$ given by (3.77). Then in*

$$(U(\mathfrak{ns})[x^{-1},\varphi][[\mathcal{B}]][\mathcal{N}])^0,$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned}\exp\Bigg(\sum_{m=-1}^{\infty}\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}\binom{-j+1}{m+1}x^{-j-m}\bigg(\Big(\mathcal{B}_j + 2\varphi\mathcal{N}_{j-\frac12}\Big)L_m \\ +\ \Big(\mathcal{N}_{j-\frac12} + \varphi x^{-1}\frac{(-j-m)}{2}\mathcal{B}_j\Big)G_{m+\frac12}\bigg)\Bigg)\end{aligned}$$

$$= e^{\left((\tilde{x}-x)L_{-1}+(\tilde{\varphi}-\varphi)G_{-\frac{1}{2}}\right)} \cdot e^{\left(-\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}\left(\Theta_j^{(2)}L_j+\Theta_{j-\frac{1}{2}}^{(2)}G_{j-\frac{1}{2}}\right)\right)} \cdot e^{\left(-2\Theta_0^{(2)}L_0\right)},$$

where $(\tilde{x},\tilde{\varphi}) = (H_{\mathcal{B},\mathcal{N}}^{(2)})^{-1}\circ I(x,\varphi)$ *is given by (3.50).*

Proof. The proof is the same as that for Proposition 3.33 except that in this case we only consider the subalgebra with basis L_j, $G_{j+1/2}$, for $j \geq -1$ and use Proposition 3.31 instead of Proposition 3.28. □

From Propositions 3.32 and 3.38, we have the following corollary.

Corollary 3.39. *In* $((\mathrm{End}\, V)[x^{-1},\varphi][[\mathcal{B}]][\mathcal{N}])^0$, *we have*

$$\exp\Bigg(\sum_{m=-1}^{\infty}\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}\binom{-j+1}{m+1}x^{-j-m}\bigg(\Big(\mathcal{B}_j+2\varphi\mathcal{N}_{j-\frac{1}{2}}\Big)L(m) + \Big(\mathcal{N}_{j-\frac{1}{2}}+\varphi x^{-1}\frac{(-j-m)}{2}\mathcal{B}_j\Big)G(m+\frac{1}{2})\bigg)\Bigg) \tag{3.91}$$

$$= e^{\left((\tilde{x}-x)L(-1)+(\tilde{\varphi}-\varphi)G(-\frac{1}{2})\right)} \cdot e^{\left(-\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}\left(\Theta_j^{(2)}L(j)+\Theta_{j-\frac{1}{2}}^{(2)}G(j-\frac{1}{2})\right)\right)} \cdot e^{\left(-2\Theta_0^{(2)}L(0)\right)},$$

for $(\tilde{x},\tilde{\varphi}) = (H_{\mathcal{B},\mathcal{N}}^{(2)})^{-1}\circ I(x,\varphi)$.

3.7. The corresponding identities for positive-energy representations of the $N = 1$ Neveu-Schwarz algebra

Using positive-energy representations of the Neveu-Schwarz algebra, we study the formal series Γ, Ψ_j, for $j \in \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{Z}$, and $\Theta_j^{(1)}$ and $\Theta_j^{(2)}$, for $j \in \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{N}$, and will see that for these representations the identities (3.89), (3.90) and (3.91) become identities containing only a finite number of formal variables.

Proposition 3.40. *The formal series* Ψ_j, *for* $j \in \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{Z}$, *and* Γ *are actually in*

$$\mathbb{C}[\mathcal{A}][\mathcal{M}][\mathcal{B}][\mathcal{N}][[\alpha_0^{-\frac{1}{2}}]].$$

Proof. Using the Verma modules $M(c,h)$ defined in Section 3.5 and Corollary 3.35, the proof is completely analogous to the proof of Lemma 4.3.1 in [**H2**]. □

We have the following immediate corollary of Proposition 3.40.

Corollary 3.41. *Let* (A,M) *and* (B,N) *be two sequences in* $\bigwedge_*^\infty$; *let* $a_\Box \in (\bigwedge_*^0)^\times$; *and let* $t^{1/2}$ *be an even formal variable. Then* $\Psi_j(t^{-1/2}a_\Box, A, M, B, N)$, *for* $j \in \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{Z}$, *and* $\Gamma(t^{-1/2}a_\Box, A, M, B, N)$ *are well defined and belong to* $\bigwedge_*[[t^{1/2}]]$.

Proposition 3.42. *Let* (A,M), (B,N), $a_\Box$ *and* $t^{1/2}$ *be as in Corollary 3.41, and let* V *be a positive-energy module for the Neveu-Schwarz algebra. Then the following identity holds in* $(\mathrm{End}\,(\bigwedge_* \otimes_{\mathbb{C}} V))^0[[t^{1/2}]]$.

$$e^{-\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}(A_jL(j)+M_{j-\frac{1}{2}}G(j-\frac{1}{2}))} \cdot (t^{-\frac{1}{2}}a_\Box)^{-2L(0)} \cdot e^{-\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}(\mathcal{B}_jL(-j)+\mathcal{N}_{j-\frac{1}{2}}G(-j+\frac{1}{2}))}. \tag{3.92}$$

$$= e^{\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}(\Psi_{-j}(t^{-\frac{1}{2}}a_\square,A,M,B,N)L(-j)+\Psi_{-j+\frac{1}{2}}(t^{-\frac{1}{2}}a_\square,A,M,B,N)G(-j+\frac{1}{2}))}\cdot$$
$$\cdot e^{\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}(\Psi_{j}(t^{-\frac{1}{2}}a_\square,A,M,B,N)L(j)+\Psi_{j-\frac{1}{2}}(t^{-\frac{1}{2}}a_\square,A,M,B,N)G(j-\frac{1}{2}))}\cdot$$
$$\cdot e^{2\Psi_0(t^{-\frac{1}{2}}a_\square,A,M,B,N)L(0)}\cdot (t^{-\frac{1}{2}}a_\square)^{-2L(0)}\cdot e^{\Gamma(t^{-\frac{1}{2}}a_\square,A,M,B,N)c}.$$

Proof. Since V is a positive energy module for $\mathfrak{ns}$ and by Corollary 3.41

$$\Psi_j(t^{-\frac{1}{2}}a_\square, A, M, B, N),\ \ \Gamma(t^{-\frac{1}{2}}a_\square, A, M, B, N) \in \bigwedge\nolimits_*[[t^{\frac{1}{2}}]],$$

for $j \in \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{Z}$, both the right-hand side and the left-hand side of (3.92) are well-defined elements in $((\mathrm{End}\,(\bigwedge_* \otimes_{\mathbb{C}} V))[[t^{1/2}]])^0$. Then by Corollary 3.35, they are equal. □

Proposition 3.43. *The formal series* $\Theta_j^{(1)}(t^{-1/2}\alpha_0^{1/2}, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{M}, (x, \varphi))$*, for* $j \in \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{N}$*, are in* $\mathbb{C}[x, \varphi][\mathcal{A}][\mathcal{M}][\alpha_0^{-1/2}][[t^{1/2}]]$. [7]

Proof. The proof is analogous to the proof of Proposition 3.40 except that we use Corollary 3.37 instead of Corollary 3.35. □

We have the following immediate corollary of Propositions 3.43.

Corollary 3.44. *Let* $a_\square \in (\bigwedge_*^0)^\times$*, and let* $(A, M) \in \bigwedge_*^\infty$*. The series*

$$\Theta_j^{(1)}(t^{-\frac{1}{2}}a_\square, A, M, (x, \varphi)),$$

for $j \in \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{N}$*, are well defined and belong to* $\bigwedge_*[x, \varphi][[t^{1/2}]]$. [8]

Let $(\tilde{x}(t^{1/2}), \tilde{\varphi}(t^{1/2})) = H^{(1)}_{t^{-1/2}a_\square, A, M}(x, \varphi)$ where $H^{(1)}_{\alpha_0^{1/2}, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{M}}(x, \varphi)$ is given by (3.48).

Proposition 3.45. *Let* $a_\square \in (\bigwedge_*^0)^\times$*; let* $(A, M) \in \bigwedge_*^\infty$*; and let* V *be a positive-energy module for the* $N = 1$ *Neveu-Schwarz algebra. Then in*

$$((\mathrm{End}\,(\bigwedge\nolimits_* \otimes_{\mathbb{C}} V))[[t^{\frac{1}{2}}]][[x, x^{-1}]][\varphi])^0,$$

the following identity holds for $\Theta_j^{(1)} = \Theta_j^{(1)}(t^{-1/2}a_\square, A, M, (x, \varphi))$.

$$\begin{aligned}(3.93)\quad \exp\Bigg(-\sum_{m=-1}^{\infty}\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}\binom{j+1}{m+1}t^j a_\square^{-2j}x^{j-m}\\ \Bigg(\Big(A_j + 2\left(\frac{j-m}{j+1}\right)t^{-\frac{1}{2}}a_\square x^{-1}\varphi M_{j-\frac{1}{2}}\Big)L(m)\\ +\ x^{-1}\Big(\left(\frac{j-m}{j+1}\right)t^{-\frac{1}{2}}a_\square M_{j-\frac{1}{2}} + \varphi\frac{(j-m)}{2}A_j\Big)G(m+\frac{1}{2})\Bigg)\Bigg)\end{aligned}$$

---

[7] There is a misprint in the analogous nonsuper case of Proposition 3.43 given in [**H2**]. The series $\Theta_j^{(1)}(\mathcal{A}, t^{-1}, \alpha_0, y)$ of Lemma 4.3.4 in [**H2**] are elements in $\mathbb{C}[y][\mathcal{A}][\alpha_0^{-1}][[t]]$, not $\mathbb{C}[y][\mathcal{A}][[t]]$ as stated.

[8] There is a misprint in the analogous nonsuper case of Corollary 3.44 in [**H2**]. Corollary 4.3.7 in [**H2**] should state that the $\Theta_j(\mathcal{A}, t^{-1}a_0, y)$, for $j \in \mathbb{N}$, belong to $\mathbb{C}[y][[t]]$, i.e., $a_0 \in \mathbb{C}^\times$ and $A_j \in \mathbb{C}$, for $j \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, with $A = \{A_j\}_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}$ should be substituted for the formal variables α_0 and $\mathcal{A}_j$ in $\Theta_j(\mathcal{A}, t^{-1}\alpha_0, y)$ in the corollary.

$$= \exp\left((\tilde{x}(t^{\frac{1}{2}}) - ta_{\Box}^{-2}x)L(-1) + (\tilde{\varphi}(t^{\frac{1}{2}}) - t^{\frac{1}{2}}a_{\Box}^{-1}\varphi)G(-\frac{1}{2})\right)\cdot$$
$$\exp\left(-\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}\left(\Theta_j^{(1)}L(j) + \Theta_{j-\frac{1}{2}}^{(1)}G(j-\frac{1}{2})\right)\right)\cdot\exp\left(-2\Theta_0^{(1)}L(0)\right).$$

Proof. Since V is a positive energy module for $\mathfrak{ns}$ and by Corollary 3.44

$$\Theta_j^{(1)}(t^{-\frac{1}{2}}a_{\Box}, A, M, (x,\varphi)) \in \bigwedge\nolimits_*[x^{-1},\varphi][[t^{\frac{1}{2}}]],$$

for $j \in \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{N}$, both the right-hand side and the left-hand side of (3.93) are well-defined elements in $((\mathrm{End}\ (\bigwedge_* \otimes_{\mathbb{C}} V))[[t^{1/2}]][[x,x^{-1}]][\varphi])^0$. Then by Corollary 3.37, they are equal. $\Box$

Proposition 3.46. *The formal series* $\Theta_j^{(2)}(\{t^k\mathcal{B}_k, t^{k-1/2}\mathcal{N}_{k-1/2}\}_{k\in\mathbb{Z}_+}, (x,\varphi))$, *for* $j \in \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{N}$, *are in* $\mathbb{C}[x^{-1},\varphi][\mathcal{B}][\mathcal{N}][[t^{1/2}]]$.

Proof. The proof is analogous to the proof of Proposition 3.40 except that we use Corollary 3.39 instead of Corollary 3.35. $\Box$

We have the following immediate corollary of Proposition 3.46.

Corollary 3.47. *Let* $(B,N) \in \bigwedge_*^\infty$. *The series*

$$\Theta_j^{(2)}(\{t^kB_k, t^{k-\frac{1}{2}}N_{k-\frac{1}{2}}\}_{k\in\mathbb{Z}_+}, (x,\varphi))$$

are well defined and belong to $\bigwedge_*[x^{-1},\varphi][[t^{1/2}]]$.

Let $(\tilde{x}(t^{1/2}), \tilde{\varphi}(t^{1/2})) = (H^{(2)}_{\{t^jB_j, t^{j-1/2}N_{j-1/2}\}_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}})^{-1}\circ I(x,\varphi)$ where $(H^{(2)}_{\mathcal{B},\mathcal{N}})^{-1}\circ I(x,\varphi)$ is given by (3.50).

Proposition 3.48. *Let* $(B,N) \in \bigwedge_*^\infty$, *and let* V *be a positive-energy module for the* $N = 1$ *Neveu-Schwarz algebra. In* $((\mathrm{End}\ (\bigwedge_* \otimes_{\mathbb{C}} V))[[t^{1/2}]][[x,x^{-1}]][\varphi])^0$, *the following identity holds for* $\Theta_j^{(2)} = \Theta_j^{(2)}(\{t^kB_k, t^{k-1/2}N_{k-1/2}\}_{k\in\mathbb{Z}_+}, (x,\varphi))$.

$$\exp\Bigg(\sum_{m=-1}^{\infty}\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}\binom{-j+1}{m+1}x^{-j-m}\bigg(\Big(t^jB_j + 2\varphi t^{j-\frac{1}{2}}N_{j-\frac{1}{2}}\Big)L(m)$$
$$+ \Big(t^{j-\frac{1}{2}}N_{j-\frac{1}{2}} + \varphi x^{-1}\frac{(-j-m)}{2}t^jB_j\Big)G(m+\frac{1}{2})\bigg)\Bigg) \tag{3.94}$$
$$= \exp\left((\tilde{x}(t^{\frac{1}{2}}) - x)L(-1) + (\tilde{\varphi}(t^{\frac{1}{2}}) - \varphi)G(-\frac{1}{2})\right)\cdot$$
$$\exp\left(-\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}\left(\Theta_j^{(2)}L(j) + \Theta_{j-\frac{1}{2}}^{(2)}G(j-\frac{1}{2})\right)\right)\cdot\exp\left(-2\Theta_0^{(2)}L(0)\right).$$

Proof. Since V is a positive energy module for $\mathfrak{ns}$ and by Corollary 3.47

$$\Theta_j^{(2)}(\{t^kB_k, t^{k-\frac{1}{2}}N_{k-\frac{1}{2}}\}_{k\in\mathbb{Z}_+}, (x,\varphi)) \in \bigwedge\nolimits_*[x^{-1},\varphi][[t^{\frac{1}{2}}]],$$

for $j \in \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{N}$, both the right-hand side and the left-hand side of (3.94) are well-defined elements in $((\mathrm{End}\ (\bigwedge_* \otimes_{\mathbb{C}} V))[[t^{1/2}]][[x,x^{-1}]][\varphi])^0$. Then by Corollary 3.39, they are equal. $\Box$

CHAPTER 4

An analytic study of the sewing operation

In this chapter, we study the moduli space of $N = 1$ superspheres with tubes and the sewing operation using the formal calculus developed in Chapter 3. We give a reformulation of the moduli space and a more explicit description of the sewing operation on this space including a solution to the sewing equation and normalization and boundary conditions. We prove the analyticity and convergence of certain infinite series arising from the sewing operation. We define a bracket operation on the $N = 1$ supermeromorphic tangent space of the moduli space of superspheres with tubes at the identity element and show that this gives a representation of the $N = 1$ Neveu-Schwarz algebra with central charge zero.

This chapter is organized as follows. In Section 4.1, using the characterization of local superconformal coordinates in terms of exponentials of certain infinite sums of superderivations proved in Chapter 3, we show that a canonical supersphere with tubes can be identified with certain data concerning the punctures and the coefficients of the infinite sums of superderivations appearing in the expressions for the local coordinates. Thus we can identify the moduli space of superspheres with tubes with the set of this data. In Section 4.2, we introduce an action of the symmetric group on n letters on the moduli space of superspheres with $1+n$ tubes. This action is used in [**B1**] and is a property needed to show that the moduli space with the sewing operation is a partial operad; see Remark 4.4.

In Section 4.3, we define supermeromorphic functions on the moduli space. We show in [**B1**], that such functions include the rational function counterparts to correlation functions for an $N = 1$ Neveu-Schwarz vertex operator superalgebra with odd formal variables [**B3**]. Using this notion of supermeromorphic function, we define the supermeromorphic tangent space of the moduli space. We show that any supermeromorphic tangent vector can be expressed as an infinite sum of supermeromorphic tangent vectors tangent to the coordinate system of the moduli space defined by the characterization of the moduli space obtained in Section 4.1.

In Section 4.4, we show that any element of the moduli space can be obtained from three types of elements with one, two and three tubes, respectively. We study some simple sewings with such elements, and show that the partial monoid of the moduli space of $1 + 1$ tubes has two subgroups which are of interest. Then we study a certain linear functional in the supermeromorphic tangent space at the identity of the moduli space of superspheres with $1 + 1$ tubes. The results of this section are used in [**B1**] and are in fact geometric versions of certain axioms for an $N = 1$ vertex operator superalgebra [**B3**], namely: associativity; the fact that the $N = 1$ vertex operator associated with the special element τ is equal to the formal series with coefficients satisfying the Neveu-Schwarz algebra relations; and the $G(-1/2)$-derivative property.

In Section 4.5, we introduce generalized superspheres with tubes which are formal analogues of superspheres with tubes in that, in general, the local coordinates are not necessarily convergent power series. We define two subsets of the moduli space of generalized superspheres with $1+1$ tubes and show that they both have group structures which are isomorphic to the structures discussed in Chapter 3.

In Section 4.6, we give a more detailed description of the sewing operation by giving a more explicit formula for obtaining a canonical supersphere with tubes from the sewing of two canonical superspheres with tubes. This involves giving an explicit description of the transformation from the sewn superspheres to a canonical supersphere. This transformation consists of the uniformizing function taking the sewn superspheres to a super-Riemann sphere and a superprojective transformation taking this super-Riemann sphere to a canonical supersphere with tubes. The uniformizing component of this transformation satisfies the sewing equation, normalization conditions and boundary conditions introduced in Chapter 2 and studied formally in Chapter 3. We show that the expansions of the two halves $F^{(1)}$ and $F^{(2)}$ of this uniformizing function as formal series in terms of the local coordinate charts correspond to the formal series $\bar{F}^{(1)} \circ s_{(z_i,\theta_i)}$ and $\bar{F}^{(2)}$ with $\bar{F}^{(1)}$ and $\bar{F}^{(2)}$ given explicitly by Theorem 3.26, equations (3.64) and (3.65) and Proposition 3.28. Thus in order to prove the analyticity and convergence of this expansion, we need only prove the analyticity and convergence of the series $\Psi_j(t^{-1/2}a_\square, A, M, B, N)$, for $j \in \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{Z}$, arising algebraically from the sewing equation.

Following [**H2**], we prove the analyticity of the series $\Psi_j(t^{-1/2}a_\square, A, M, B, N)$, for $j \in \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{Z}$, by deforming one of the superspheres being sewn and then using the Fischer-Grauert Theorem in the deformation theory of complex manifolds to show the moduli space is locally trivial under this deformation. However this theorem only holds for finite-dimensional, compact complex manifolds, e.g., the body of a supersphere, whereas super-Riemann surfaces over $\bigwedge_\infty$ are infinite-dimensional, non-compact complex manifolds. In fact they are fiber bundles over the body with fiber isomorphic to $(\bigwedge_\infty)_S$. Therefore, we define two families of global sections of our supersphere which cover the supersphere. Each section is complex analytically isomorphic to the body, i.e., to a Riemann sphere. We then use the Fischer-Grauert Theorem for each section which allows us to prove that the uniformizing function on each section of the deformed supersphere is analytic in the deformation variable $t^{1/2}$. Since the two families of sections completely cover the supersphere, this proves the analyticity of the uniformizing function, which in turn allows us to prove the analyticity and convergence of the series $\Psi_j(t^{-1/2}a_\square, A, M, B, N)$, for $j \in \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{Z}$ and $t^{1/2} \in \mathbb{C}$ with $|t^{1/2}| \leq 1$. This result shows that when two canonical superspheres can be sewn, the uniformizing function studied algebraically in Chapter 3 converges and is equal to the geometric uniformizing transformation taking the resulting sewn superspheres to a super-Riemann sphere. This proof of Proposition 4.19 is different and more concise in its use of the underlying geometry than the proof originally given in [**B1**].

In Section 4.7, we define a bracket operation on the supermeromorphic tangent space of the moduli space of superspheres with tubes at the identity element and show that this gives a representation of the $N = 1$ Neveu-Schwarz algebra with central charge zero. In proving the $N = 1$ Neveu-Schwarz algebra relations for this bracket operation, we use the information about the lower order terms in the solution to the sewing equation given formally in Theorem 3.26 and Proposition 3.28.

In defining the bracket relations we see that the definition is not as straightforward as on might initially expect it to be. This is related to the fact that the diffeomorphism group of the circle does not have a Lie group complexification, i.e, on the nonsuper level of the Virasoro Lie algebra, there is no corresponding complex Lie group (cf. [**L**]).

4.1. A reformulation of the moduli space of superspheres with tubes

Let

$$\mathcal{H} = \big\{(A, M) \in \textstyle\bigwedge_\infty^\infty \mid \tilde{E}(A, M) \text{ is an absolutely convergent power series in some neighborhood of } 0\big\},$$

and for $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, let

$$SM^{n-1} = \big\{\big((z_1, \theta_1), ..., (z_{n-1}, \theta_{n-1})\big) \mid (z_i, \theta_i) \in \textstyle\bigwedge_\infty^\times,\ (z_i)_B \neq (z_j)_B, \text{ for } i \neq j\big\}.$$

Note that for $n = 1$, the set SM^0 has exactly one element.

For any supersphere with $1 + n$ tubes, we can write the power series expansion of the local coordinate at the i-th puncture (z_i, θ_i), for $i = 1, ..., n$, as

$$\begin{aligned} H_i(w, \rho) &= \exp\Bigg(-\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}\Big(A_j^{(i)}L_j(x, \varphi) + M_{j-\frac{1}{2}}^{(i)}G_{j-\frac{1}{2}}\Big)\Bigg) \cdot \\ &\qquad\qquad \cdot (a_\square^{(i)})^{-2L_0(x,\varphi)} \cdot (x, \varphi)\Big|_{(x,\varphi)=(w-z_i-\rho\theta_i, \rho-\theta_i)} \\ &= \hat{E}(a_\square^{(i)}, A^{(i)}, M^{(i)})(w - z_i - \rho\theta_i, \rho - \theta_i) \end{aligned}$$

for $(a_\square^{(i)}, A^{(i)}, M^{(i)}) \in (\bigwedge_\infty^0)^\times \times \mathcal{H}$, and we can write the power series expansion of the local coordinate at ∞ as

$$\begin{aligned} H_0(w, \rho) &= \exp\Bigg(\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}\Big(A_j^{(0)}L_{-j}(w, \rho) + M_{j-\frac{1}{2}}^{(0)}G_{-j+\frac{1}{2}}(w, \rho)\Big)\Bigg) \cdot \Big(\frac{1}{w}, \frac{i\rho}{w}\Big) \\ &= \tilde{E}(A^{(0)}, -iM^{(0)})\Big(\frac{1}{w}, \frac{i\rho}{w}\Big) \end{aligned}$$

for $(A^{(0)}, -iM^{(0)}) \in \mathcal{H}$. But $(A^{(0)}, -iM^{(0)}) \in \mathcal{H}$ if and only if $(A^{(0)}, M^{(0)}) \in \mathcal{H}$.

Thus we have the following proposition.

Proposition 4.1. *The moduli space of superspheres with $1 + n$ tubes, for $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, can be identified with the set*

$$SK(n) = SM^{n-1} \times \mathcal{H} \times \big((\textstyle\bigwedge_\infty^0)^\times \times \mathcal{H}\big)^n. \tag{4.1}$$

For superspheres with one tube, we have:

Proposition 4.2. *The moduli space of superspheres with one tube can be identified with the set*

$$SK(0) = \big\{(A, M) \in \mathcal{H} \mid (A_1, M_{\frac{1}{2}}) = (0, 0)\big\}.$$

By Propositions 4.1 and 4.2, we can identify $SK(n)$ with the moduli space of superspheres with $1 + n$ tubes for $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and the set

$$SK = \bigcup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} SK(n)$$

can be identified with the moduli space of superspheres with tubes. The actual elements of SK give the data for a canonical supersphere representative of a given equivalence class of superspheres with tubes modulo superconformal equivalence. From now on it will be convenient to refer to SK as the moduli space of superspheres with tubes. Any element of $SK(n)$, for $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, can be written as

$$\big((z_1,\theta_1),...,(z_{n-1},\theta_{n-1});(A^{(0)},M^{(0)}),(a_\square^{(1)},A^{(1)},M^{(1)}),...,(a_\square^{(n)},A^{(n)},M^{(n)})\big)$$

where $(z_1,\theta_1),...,(z_{n-1},\theta_{n-1}) \in SM^{n-1}$, $(A^{(0)},M^{(0)}) \in \mathcal{H}$, and

$$(a_\square^{(1)},A^{(1)},M^{(1)}),...,(a_\square^{(n)},A^{(n)},M^{(n)}) \in (\textstyle\bigwedge_\infty^0)^\times \times \mathcal{H}.$$

Thus for an element $Q \in SK$, we can think of Q as consisting of the above data, or as being a canonical supersphere with tubes corresponding to that data.

In Chapter 2 we introduced the sewing operation for superspheres with tubes. This gave rise to the sewing equation (2.49), normalization conditions (2.51) – (2.53) and boundary conditions (2.54) – (2.57) derived from taking two canonical superspheres with tubes, sewing them together and looking at the uniformizing function which maps the resulting supersphere to a super-Riemann sphere. This resulting super-Riemann sphere is then superconformal to a canonical supersphere, i.e., an element in SK, via a superprojective transformation.

Thus for any $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, $m \in \mathbb{N}$, and any positive integer $i \leq n$, the sewing operation for superspheres with tubes defined in Chapter 2 induces an operation ${}_i\infty_0 : SK(n) \times SK(m) \to SK(n+m-1)$. We will still call it the *sewing operation*, and as in [**H2**], we will use the notation ${}_i\infty_0$ first introduced by Vafa [**V**] to denote the sewing, although now we use it to denote the sewing operation on SK. Recall that given two elements Q_1 and Q_2 of SK, it may not be possible to sew the i-th puncture of Q_1 with the 0-th puncture of Q_2 without rescaling the local coordinate map of Q_1 at its i-th puncture.

The element of $\mathcal{H}$ with all components equal to 0 will be denoted by $(\mathbf{0},\mathbf{0})$ or just $\mathbf{0}$. Note that in terms of the chart (U_Δ,Δ) of $S\hat{\mathbb{C}}$, the local coordinate chart corresponding to $(1,\mathbf{0},\mathbf{0}) \in (\bigwedge_\infty^0)^\times \times \mathcal{H}$ is the identity map on $\bigwedge_\infty$ if the puncture is at 0, is the shift $s_{(z_i,\theta_i)}(w,\rho) = (w - z_i - \rho\theta_i, \rho - \theta_i)$ if the puncture is at (z_i,θ_i), and is $I(w,\rho) = (1/w, i\rho/w)$ if the puncture is at ∞. We will sometimes refer to such coordinates as *standard local coordinates.*

Using the definition of sewing from Chapter 2, we see that SK has a unit e under the sewing operation

$$e = (\mathbf{0},(1,\mathbf{0})) \in SK(1) \tag{4.2}$$

in the sense that for $Q \in SK(n)$ and $0 < i \leq n$, the i-th puncture of Q can always be sewn with the 0-th puncture of e, the first puncture of e can always be sewn with the 0-th puncture of Q, and we have

$$Q \;{}_i\infty_0\; e = Q, \qquad e \;{}_1\infty_0\; Q = Q.$$

From the geometry of sewing, the following associativity of the sewing operation is obvious.

Proposition 4.3. *Let $l \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ and $m,n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $l+m-1 \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, and let $Q_1 \in SK(l)$, $Q_2 \in SK(m)$, $Q_3 \in SK(n)$, and $i,j \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ such that $1 \leq i \leq l$, and $1 \leq j \leq l+m-1$. The iterated sewings $(Q_1 \;{}_i\infty_0\; Q_2) \;{}_j\infty_0\; Q_3$ exist if and only if one of the following holds:*

(i) $j < i$ *and the sewings* $(Q_1\ {}_j\infty_0\ Q_3)\ {}_{i+n-1}\infty_0\ Q_2$ *exist, in which case*

$$(Q_1\ {}_i\infty_0\ Q_2)\ {}_j\infty_0\ Q_3 = (Q_1\ {}_j\infty_0\ Q_3)\ {}_{i+n-1}\infty_0\ Q_2;$$

(ii) $j \geq i + m$ *and the sewings* $(Q_1\ {}_{j-m+1}\infty_0\ Q_3)\ {}_i\infty_0\ Q_2$ *exist, in which case*

$$(Q_1\ {}_i\infty_0\ Q_2)\ {}_j\infty_0\ Q_3 = (Q_1\ {}_{j-m+1}\infty_0\ Q_3)\ {}_i\infty_0\ Q_2;$$

or

(iii) $i \leq j < i + m$ *and the sewings* $Q_1\ {}_i\infty_0\ (Q_2\ {}_{j-i+1}\infty_0\ Q_3)$ *exist, in which case*

$$(Q_1\ {}_i\infty_0\ Q_2)\ {}_j\infty_0\ Q_3 = Q_1\ {}_i\infty_0\ (Q_2\ {}_{j-i+1}\infty_0\ Q_3).$$

4.2. An action of the symmetric group S_n on the moduli space $SK(n)$

Let S_n be the group of permutations on n letters, for $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$. There is a natural (right) action of S_{n-1} on $SK(n)$ defined by permuting the ordering on the first $n-1$ positively oriented punctures and their local coordinates. More explicitly, for $\sigma \in S_{n-1}$, and $Q \in SK(n)$ given by

$$Q = \big((z_1, \theta_1), ..., (z_{n-1}, \theta_{n-1}); (A^{(0)}, M^{(0)}), (a_\square^{(1)}, A^{(1)}, M^{(1)}), ..., (a_\square^{(n)}, A^{(n)}, M^{(n)})\big),$$

we define

$$\begin{aligned} Q^\sigma = \big(&(z_{\sigma^{-1}(1)}, \theta_{\sigma^{-1}(1)}), ..., (z_{\sigma^{-1}(n-1)}, \theta_{\sigma^{-1}(n-1)}); (A^{(0)}, M^{(0)}),\\ &(a_\square^{(\sigma^{-1}(1))}, A^{(\sigma^{-1}(1))}, M^{(\sigma^{-1}(1))}), ..., (a_\square^{(\sigma^{-1}(n-1))}, A^{(\sigma^{-1}(n-1))}, M^{(\sigma^{-1}(n-1))})\\ &\qquad (a_\square^{(n)}, A^{(n)}, M^{(n)})\big). \end{aligned}$$

To extend this to a right action of S_n on $SK(n)$, we first note that S_n is generated by the symmetric group on the first $n-1$ letters S_{n-1} and the transposition $(n-1\ n)$. We can let $(n-1\ n)$ act on $SK(n)$ by permuting the $(n-1)$-st and n-th punctures and their local coordinates for a canonical supersphere with $1+n$ tubes but the resulting supersphere with $1+n$ tubes is not canonical. To obtain the superconformally equivalent canonical supersphere, we have to translate the new n-th puncture to 0. This translation will not change the local coordinates at positively oriented punctures but will change the local coordinates at the negatively oriented puncture ∞. This translation is given by

$$\begin{array}{rcl} T_\Delta : \bigwedge_\infty & \longrightarrow & \bigwedge_\infty \\ (w, \rho) & \mapsto & (w - z_{n-1} - \rho\theta_{n-1}, \rho - \theta_{n-1}), \end{array}$$

and thus by (2.23), we have $T : S\hat{\mathbb{C}} \to S\hat{\mathbb{C}}$ given by

$$T(p) = \begin{cases} \Delta^{-1} \circ T_\Delta \circ \Delta(p) & \text{if } p \in U_\Delta, \\ \Upsilon^{-1} \circ T_\Upsilon \circ \Upsilon(p) & \text{if } p \in U_\Upsilon \smallsetminus \Upsilon^{-1}(\{(\frac{1}{z_{n-1}})_B\} \times (\bigwedge_\infty)_S) \end{cases}$$

where

$$T_\Upsilon = \left(\frac{w}{1 - wz_{n-1}} + \frac{i\rho\theta_{n-1}w}{(1 - wz_{n-1})^2}, \frac{i\theta_{n-1}w}{1 - wz_{n-1}} + \frac{\rho}{1 - wz_{n-1}}\right).$$

The new local coordinate at infinity can be written as $\tilde{E}(\tilde{A}^{(0)}, -i\tilde{M}^{(0)})(1/w, i\rho/w)$, and it is determined by the old local coordinate at infinity and the superprojective transformation T via

$$\tilde{E}(\tilde{A}^{(0)}, -i\tilde{M}^{(0)})\Big(\frac{1}{w}, \frac{i\rho}{w}\Big) = \tilde{E}(A^{(0)}, -iM^{(0)}) \circ I \circ T_\Delta^{-1}(w, \rho).$$

Using Proposition 3.20, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\tilde{E}(\tilde{A}^{(0)}, -i\tilde{M}^{(0)})\Big(\frac{1}{w}, \frac{i\rho}{w}\Big)\\
&\quad= \exp\Bigg(\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+} \Big(\tilde{A}_j^{(0)} L_{-j}(w,\rho) + \tilde{M}_{j-\frac{1}{2}}^{(0)} G_{-j+\frac{1}{2}}(w,\rho)\Big)\Bigg)\cdot\Big(\frac{1}{w}, \frac{i\rho}{w}\Big)\\
&\quad= \exp\Bigg(\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+} \Big(A_j^{(0)} L_{-j}(x,\varphi) + M_{j-\frac{1}{2}}^{(0)} G_{-j+\frac{1}{2}}(x,\varphi)\Big)\Bigg)\cdot\\
&\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad \cdot\Big(\frac{1}{x}, \frac{i\varphi}{x}\Big)\bigg|_{(x,\varphi)=(w+z_{n-1}+\rho\theta_{n-1},\rho+\theta_{n-1})}\\
&\quad= \exp\bigg(z_{n-1}\frac{\partial}{\partial w} + \theta_{n-1}\Big(\frac{\partial}{\partial \rho} - \rho\frac{\partial}{\partial w}\Big)\bigg)\cdot\\
&\qquad\qquad \cdot\exp\Bigg(\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+} \Big(A_j^{(0)} L_{-j}(w,\rho) + M_{j-\frac{1}{2}}^{(0)} G_{-j+\frac{1}{2}}(w,\rho)\Big)\Bigg)\cdot\Big(\frac{1}{w}, \frac{i\rho}{w}\Big)\\
&\quad= \exp\Big(-z_{n-1}L_{-1}(w,\rho) - \theta_{n-1}G_{-\frac{1}{2}}(w,\rho)\Big)\cdot\\
&\qquad\qquad \cdot\exp\Bigg(\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+} \Big(A_j^{(0)} L_{-j}(w,\rho) + M_{j-\frac{1}{2}}^{(0)} G_{-j+\frac{1}{2}}(w,\rho)\Big)\Bigg)\cdot\Big(\frac{1}{w}, \frac{i\rho}{w}\Big).
\end{aligned}
\tag{4.3}
$$

Then

$$
\begin{aligned}
&Q^{(n-1\ n)}\\
&\quad= \Big(\infty, (z_1,\theta_1), ..., (z_{n-2},\theta_{n-2}), 0, (z_{n-1},\theta_{n-1}); (A^{(0)}, M^{(0)}), (a_\square^{(1)}, A^{(1)}, M^{(1)}),\\
&\qquad\quad ..., (a_\square^{(n-2)}, A^{(n-2)}, M^{(n-2)}), (a_\square^{(n)}, A^{(n)}, M^{(n)}), (a_\square^{(n-1)}, A^{(n-1)}, M^{(n-1)})\Big)\\
&\quad= \Big(\infty, (z_1 - z_{n-1} - \theta_1\theta_{n-1}, \theta_1 - \theta_{n-1}), (z_2 - z_{n-1} - \theta_2\theta_{n-1}, \theta_2 - \theta_{n-1}), ...,\\
&\qquad\quad (z_{n-2} - z_{n-1} - \theta_{n-2}\theta_{n-1}, \theta_{n-2} - \theta_{n-1}), (-z_{n-1}, -\theta_{n-1}), 0; (\tilde{A}^{(0)}, \tilde{M}^{(0)}),\\
&\qquad\quad (a_\square^{(1)}, A^{(1)}, M^{(1)}), ..., (a_\square^{(n-2)}, A^{(n-2)}, M^{(n-2)}), (a_\square^{(n)}, A^{(n)}, M^{(n)}),\\
&\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad (a_\square^{(n-1)}, A^{(n-1)}, M^{(n-1)})\Big) \in SK(n).
\end{aligned}
$$

Thus we have an action of S_n on $SK(n)$.

REMARK 4.4. The moduli space of $N = 1$ superspheres with tubes, SK, along with the sewing operation and the action of the symmetric group defined above, is an example of a partial operad (cf. [**M**], [**HL2**], [**HL3**], [**H2**]).

4.3. Supermeromorphic superfunctions on SK and supermeromorphic tangent spaces of SK

A *supermeromorphic superfunction on* $SK(n)$, for $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, is a superfunction $F : SK(n) \to \bigwedge_\infty$ of the form

$$\begin{aligned}
(4.4) \qquad F(Q) &= F\big((z_1,\theta_1),...,(z_{n-1},\theta_{n-1});(A^{(0)},M^{(0)}),(a_\square^{(1)},A^{(1)},M^{(1)}),...,\\
&\qquad\qquad (a_\square^{(n)},A^{(n)},M^{(n)})\big)\\
&= F_0\big((z_1,\theta_1),...,(z_{n-1},\theta_{n-1});(A^{(0)},M^{(0)}),(a_\square^{(1)},A^{(1)},M^{(1)}),...,\\
&\qquad (a_\square^{(n)},A^{(n)},M^{(n)})\big)\times\left(\prod_{i=1}^{n-1} z_i^{-s_i}\prod_{1\le i<j\le n-1}(z_i-z_j-\theta_i\theta_j)^{-s_{ij}}\right)
\end{aligned}$$

where s_i and s_{ij} are nonnegative integers and

$$F_0\big((z_1,\theta_1),...,(z_{n-1},\theta_{n-1});(A^{(0)},M^{(0)}),(a_\square^{(1)},A^{(1)},M^{(1)}),...,(a_\square^{(n)},A^{(n)},M^{(n)})\big)$$

is a polynomial in the z_i's, θ_i's, $a_\square^{(i)}$'s, $(a_\square^{(i)})^{-1}$'s, $A_j^{(i)}$'s, and $M_{j-1/2}^{(i)}$'s. For $n = 0$ a *supermeromorphic superfunction on* $SK(0)$ is a polynomial in the components of elements of $SK(0)$, i.e., a polynomial in the $A_j^{(0)}$'s, and $M_{j-1/2}^{(0)}$'s. For F of the form (4.4), we say that F has a pole of order s_{ij} at $(z_i,\theta_i) = (z_j,\theta_j)$.

Since $(z_i - z_j - \theta_i\theta_j)^{-s_{ij}} = (z_i - z_j)^{-s_{ij}} + s_{ij}\theta_i\theta_j(z_i - z_j)^{-s_{ij}-1}$, we can expand (4.4) to be of the form

$$\begin{aligned}
(4.5) \quad &\tilde{F}_0\big((z_1,\theta_1),...,(z_{n-1},\theta_{n-1});(A^{(0)},M^{(0)}),(a_\square^{(1)},A^{(1)},M^{(1)}),...,\\
&\qquad (a_\square^{(n)},A^{(n)},M^{(n)})\big)\times\left(\prod_{i=1}^{n-1} z_i^{-s_i}\prod_{1\le i<j\le n-1}(z_i-z_j)^{-s_{ij}-1}\right)
\end{aligned}$$

where $\tilde{F}_0$ is a polynomial in the z_i's, θ_i's, $a_\square^{(i)}$'s, $(a_\square^{(i)})^{-1}$'s, $A_j^{(i)}$'s, and $M_{j-1/2}^{(i)}$'s. Also note that since the meaning of the expression $(z_i - z_j - \theta_i\theta_j)^{-s_{ij}}$ is the expansion about the body $((z_i)_B - (z_j)_B)^{-s_{ij}}$ in powers of the soul, in general this expression has an infinite number of negative powers of $((z_i)_B - (z_j)_B)$. However, if we let $\{\zeta_1, \zeta_2, ...\}$ be the fixed basis for the underlying vector space of $\bigwedge_\infty$, we see that each $\zeta_{i_1}\zeta_{i_2}\cdots\zeta_{i_{2l}}$ term in $(z_i - z_j - \theta_i\theta_j)^{-s_{ij}}$ has a finite number of negative powers of $((z_i)_B - (z_j)_B)$, and $(z_i - z_j - \theta_i\theta_j)^{s_{ij}}(z_i - z_j - \theta_i\theta_j)^{-s_{ij}} = 1$.

The set of all canonical supermeromorphic superfunctions on $SK(n)$ is denoted by $SD(n)$. Note that $SD(n)$ has a natural $\mathbb{Z}_2$-grading since any supermeromorphic superfunction F can be decomposed into an even component F^0 and an odd component F^1 where $F^0(Q) \in \bigwedge_\infty^0$, for all $Q \in SK$ and $F^1(Q) \in \bigwedge_\infty^1$ for all $Q \in SK$.

An *even supermeromorphic tangent vector* of SK at a point $Q \in SK$ is a linear map

$$(4.6) \qquad \mathcal{L}_Q : SD(n) \longrightarrow \textstyle\bigwedge_\infty$$

such that for $F_1, F_2 \in SD(n)$

$$(4.7) \qquad \mathcal{L}_Q(F_1F_2) = \mathcal{L}_Q F_1 \cdot F_2(Q) + F_1(Q)\cdot \mathcal{L}_Q F_2,$$

and an *odd supermeromorphic tangent vector* of SK at a point $Q \in SK$ is a linear map

$$\mathcal{L}_Q : SD(n) \longrightarrow \bigwedge_\infty \tag{4.8}$$

such that for F_1 of homogeneous sign in $SD(n)$,

$$\mathcal{L}_Q(F_1F_2) = \mathcal{L}_Q F_1 \cdot F_2(Q) + (-1)^{\eta(F_1)} F_1(Q) \cdot \mathcal{L}_Q F_2. \tag{4.9}$$

The set of all supermeromorphic tangent vectors at Q is the *supermeromorphic tangent space of* SK *at* Q and is denoted $T_Q SK$ (or $T_Q SK(n)$ when $Q \in SK(n)$). Note that $T_Q SK$ is naturally $\mathbb{Z}_2$-graded, and thus we can define the sign function η on $T_Q SK$ (see Section 2.1). It is obvious that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial}{\partial z_i}\bigg|_Q, \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_i}\bigg|_Q, &\qquad \text{for } i = 1, ..., n-1, \\ \frac{\partial}{\partial a_\square^{(i)}}\bigg|_Q, &\qquad \text{for } i = 1, ..., n, \text{ and} \\ \frac{\partial}{\partial A_j^{(i)}}\bigg|_Q, \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial M_{j-\frac{1}{2}}^{(i)}}\bigg|_Q, &\qquad \text{for } i = 0, ..., n \text{ and } j \in \mathbb{Z}_+, \end{aligned}$$

are in $T_Q SK(n)$. Because any supermeromorphic function on $SK(n)$ depends on only finitely many of the variables z_i, θ_i, for $i = 1, ..., n-1$, $a_\square^{(i)}$, for $i = 1, ..., n$, and $A_j^{(i)}$, and $M_{j-1/2}^{(i)}$, for $i = 0, ..., n$ and $j \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, the proof of the following proposition is the same as that for the tangent spaces of a finite-dimensional manifold.

PROPOSITION 4.5. *Any supermeromorphic tangent vector* $\mathcal{L}_Q$ *can be expressed as*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_Q = \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \left(\alpha_i \frac{\partial}{\partial z_i}\bigg|_Q + \beta_i \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_i}\bigg|_Q \right) + \sum_{i=1}^{n} \delta_i \frac{\partial}{\partial a_\square^{(i)}}\bigg|_Q \\ + \sum_{i=0}^{n} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}_+} \left(\gamma_i^j \frac{\partial}{\partial A_j^{(i)}}\bigg|_Q + \nu_i^j \frac{\partial}{\partial M_{j-\frac{1}{2}}^{(i)}}\bigg|_Q \right) \end{aligned} \tag{4.10}$$

where

$$\alpha_i = \mathcal{L}_Q z_i, \quad \beta_i = \mathcal{L}_Q \theta_i, \quad \delta_i = \mathcal{L}_Q a_\square^{(i)}, \quad \gamma_i^j = \mathcal{L}_Q A_j^{(i)}, \quad \nu_i^j = \mathcal{L}_Q M_{j-\frac{1}{2}}^{(i)}.$$

If $\eta(\mathcal{L}_Q) = 0$, *then* $\alpha_i, \delta_i, \gamma_i^j \in \bigwedge_\infty^0$ *and* $\beta_i, \nu_i^j \in \bigwedge_\infty^1$. *If* $\eta(\mathcal{L}_Q) = 1$, *then* $\alpha_i, \delta_i, \gamma_i^j \in \bigwedge_\infty^1$ *and* $\beta_i, \nu_i^j \in \bigwedge_\infty^0$.

Note that in (4.10) we have an infinite sum. This is well defined since when acting on any element of $SD(n)$ it becomes a finite sum.

4.4. The sewing operation and superspheres with one, two, and three tubes

PROPOSITION 4.6. *Any element* $Q \in SK$ *can be obtained by sewing the following types of elements of* SK

(i) $(\mathbf{0}) \in SK(0)$,

(ii) $\big((A^{(0)}, M^{(0)}), (a_\square^{(1)}, A^{(1)}, M^{(1)})\big) \in SK(1)$,

(iii) $\big((z, \theta); \mathbf{0}, (1, \mathbf{0}), (1, \mathbf{0})\big) \in SK(2)$.

PROOF. The proof for $Q \in SK(n)$ is by induction on n. If $Q = (A^{(0)}, M^{(0)}) \in SK(0)$, then

$$Q = \big((A^{(0)}, M^{(0)}), (a_\square^{(1)}, A^{(1)}, M^{(1)})\big)\ {}_1\infty_0\ (\mathbf{0})$$

is a type (ii) supersphere sewn with a type (i) supersphere.

If $Q \in SK(1)$, then it is type (ii).

If $Q \in SK(n)$ for $n \geq 2$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned} Q = \big((z_1, \theta_1), ..., (z_{n-1}, \theta_{n-1}); (A^{(0)}, M^{(0)}), (a_\square^{(1)}, A^{(1)}, M^{(1)}), ...,& \\ (a_\square^{(n)}, A^{(n)}, M^{(n)})\big),& \end{aligned}$$

then

$$\begin{aligned} Q = \big((A^{(0)}, M^{(0)}), (1, \mathbf{0})\big)\ {}_1\infty_0 \bigg(\bigg(\cdots \bigg(\bigg(\big((z_1, \theta_1), ..., (z_{n-1}, \theta_{n-1}); \mathbf{0}, (1, \mathbf{0}), ...,& \\ (1, \mathbf{0})\big)\ {}_1\infty_0\ \big(\mathbf{0}, (a_\square^{(1)}, A^{(1)}, M^{(1)})\big)\bigg)\ {}_2\infty_0 \big(\mathbf{0}, (a_\square^{(2)}, A^{(2)}, M^{(2)})\big)\bigg)\ {}_3\infty_0& \\ \cdots\bigg)\ {}_n\infty_0\ \big(\mathbf{0}, (a_\square^{(n)}, A^{(n)}, M^{(n)})\big)\bigg)& \end{aligned}$$

which consists of $n+1$ type (ii) superspheres and the supersphere

$$Q'_n = \big((z_1, \theta_1), ..., (z_{n-1}, \theta_{n-1}); \mathbf{0}, (1, \mathbf{0}), ..., (1, \mathbf{0})\big)$$

sewn together. Thus we need only prove that Q'_n can be obtained from type (i), (ii), and (iii) superspheres for $n > 2$. Assume this is true for $k < n$. Let γ be a closed Jordan curve on the body of Q'_n, denoted $(Q'_n)_B$, such that 0 and $(z_{n-1})_B$ are in one connected component of $(Q'_n)_B \smallsetminus \gamma$ (which we will call the interior of γ) and $(z_1)_B, ..., (z_{n-2})_B$ are in the other connected component of $(Q'_n)_B \smallsetminus \gamma$ (which we will call the exterior of γ). By the Riemann mapping theorem there exists a conformal map f_B from the interior of γ to the open unit disc in $\mathbb{C}$, and we can require that $f_B(0) = 0$. Then by expanding $f_B(z_B)$ about 0 and choosing $a_\square \in \mathbb{C}^\times$ such that $a_\square^2 = f'_B(0)$, we can let $H(x, \varphi)$ be the unique formally superconformal power series such that $\varphi H(x, \varphi) = \varphi f_B(x)$ is of the form (3.23) with even coefficient of φ equal to $a_\square$. Then $H^{-1}(x, \varphi)$ and $s_{(z_{n-1}, 0)} \circ H^{-1}(x + f_B(z_{n-1}), \varphi)$ also satisfy (3.23) for $s_{(z_{n-1},0)}(x, \varphi) = (x - z_{n-1}, \varphi)$.

Let

$$\begin{aligned} (a_\square, A, \mathbf{0}) &= \hat{E}^{-1}(H(x, \varphi)), \\ (a'_\square, A', \mathbf{0}) &= \hat{E}^{-1}(H^{-1}(x, \varphi)) = \big(a_\square^{-1}, \{-a_\square^{-2j} A_j, \}_{j \in \mathbb{Z}_+}, \mathbf{0}\big) \\ (b_\square, B, \mathbf{0}) &= \hat{E}^{-1}\big(s_{(z_{n-1},0)} \circ H^{-1}(x + f_B(z_{n-1}), \varphi)\big). \end{aligned}$$

Then from the definition of the sewing operation, we have

$$\begin{aligned} Q'_n &= \big((z_1, \theta_1), ..., (z_{n-2}, \theta_{n-2}); \mathbf{0}, (1, \mathbf{0}), ..., (1, \mathbf{0}), (a_\square, A, \mathbf{0})\big)\ {}_{n-1}\infty_0 \\ &\qquad\qquad \big(H(z_{n-1}, \theta_{n-1}); \mathbf{0}, (b_\square, B, \mathbf{0}), (a'_\square, A', \mathbf{0})\big) \\ &= \Big(\big((z_1, \theta_1), ..., (z_{n-2}, \theta_{n-2}); \mathbf{0}, (1, \mathbf{0}), ..., (1, \mathbf{0})\big)\ {}_{n-1}\infty_0\ \big(\mathbf{0}, (a_\square, A, \mathbf{0})\big)\Big) \\ &\qquad\qquad {}_{n-1}\infty_0\ \big(H(z_{n-1}, \theta_{n-1}); \mathbf{0}, (b_\square, B, \mathbf{0}), (a'_\square, A', \mathbf{0})\big) \end{aligned}$$

which is obtained from sewing Q'_{n-1}, a supersphere of type (ii), and a supersphere in $SK(2)$. By our inductive assumption, the result follows. $\square$

It is clear from the definition of sewing that $SK(1)$ is a partial monoid. In the following proposition, we give some subgroups of $SK(1)$.

Proposition 4.7. *Let* $s, t \in \bigwedge_\infty^0$, *and* $(A, M) \in \bigwedge_\infty^\infty$. *Assume*

$$s(A, M), t(A, M) \in \mathcal{H}.$$

Then $(s+t)(A, M) \in \mathcal{H}$, *both*

$$\big(\mathbf{0}, (1, t(A, M)\big) \;{}_1\infty_0\; \big(\mathbf{0}, (1, s(A, M)\big)$$

and

$$\big(s(A, M), (1, \mathbf{0})\big) \;{}_1\infty_0\; \big(t(A, M), (1, \mathbf{0})\big)$$

exist, and we have

$$\big(\mathbf{0}, (1, (s+t)(A, M))\big) = \big(\mathbf{0}, (1, t(A, M)\big) \;{}_1\infty_0\; \big(\mathbf{0}, (1, s(A, M)\big), \tag{4.11}$$

$$\big((s+t)(A, M), (1, \mathbf{0})\big) = \big(s(A, M), (1, \mathbf{0})\big) \;{}_1\infty_0\; \big(t(A, M), (1, \mathbf{0})\big). \tag{4.12}$$

In particular, for $(A, M) \in \mathcal{H}$, *the sets*

$$\big\{\big(\mathbf{0}, (1, t(A, M)\big) \mid t \in \textstyle\bigwedge_\infty^0,\ t(A, M) \in \mathcal{H}\big\} \tag{4.13}$$

and

$$\big\{\big(t(A, M), (1, \mathbf{0})\big) \mid t \in \textstyle\bigwedge_\infty^0,\ t(A, M) \in \mathcal{H}\big\} \tag{4.14}$$

are subgroups of $SK(1)$. *In addition we have the subgroups given by taking* $A = \mathbf{0}$ *or* $M = \mathbf{0}$ *in (4.13) and (4.14).*

Proof. Recall that in Chapter 3, we defined a group operation on infinite sequences in a superalgebra R; see (3.31). Letting $R = \bigwedge_\infty$, and for $(A, M), (\overline{A}, \overline{M}) \in \bigwedge_\infty^\infty$ this operation is given by

$$(A, M) \circ (\overline{A}, \overline{M}) = \tilde{E}^{-1}\big(\tilde{E}(\overline{A}, \overline{M}) \circ \tilde{E}(A, M)(x, \varphi)\big). \tag{4.15}$$

Let

$$H_s(x, \varphi) = \tilde{E}(sA, sM), \quad \text{and} \quad H_t(x, \varphi) = \tilde{E}(tA, tM).$$

Since $s(A, M)$, and $t(A, M)$ are in $\mathcal{H}$, the superfunctions $H_s(w, \rho)$ and $H_t(w, \rho)$ are convergent in a neighborhood of $0 \in \bigwedge_\infty$. Hence $H_s \circ H_t(w, \rho)$ and $H_t \circ H_s(w, \rho)$ are convergent in a neighborhood of 0. Thus by (4.15), we see that $s(A, M) \circ t(A, M)$ and $t(A, M) \circ s(A, M)$ are in $\mathcal{H}$. By Proposition 3.15,

$$(s+t)(A, M) = s(A, M) \circ t(A, M) = t(A, M) \circ s(A, M).$$

Thus $(s+t)(A, M) \in \mathcal{H}$. From the definition of the sewing operation, we see that

$$\big(\mathbf{0}, (1, s(A, M) \circ t(A, M))\big) = \big(\mathbf{0}, (1, t(A, M)\big) \;{}_1\infty_0\; \big(\mathbf{0}, (1, s(A, M)\big),$$

and

$$\big(s(A, M) \circ t(A, M), (1, \mathbf{0})\big) = \big(s(A, M), (1, \mathbf{0})\big) \;{}_1\infty_0\; \big(t(A, M), (1, \mathbf{0})\big).$$

This then gives (4.11) and (4.12). □

PROPOSITION 4.8. *Let* $z_1, z_2 \in \bigwedge_\infty^0$ *such that* $|(z_1)_B| > |(z_2)_B| > |(z_1)_B - (z_2)_B| > 0$. *Then*

$$\begin{aligned}
&\big((z_1,\theta_1),(z_2,\theta_2);\mathbf{0},(1,\mathbf{0}),(1,\mathbf{0}),(1,\mathbf{0})\big) = \\
(4.16)\qquad &= \big((z_2,\theta_2);\mathbf{0},(1,\mathbf{0}),(1,\mathbf{0})\big)\ {}_1\infty_0\ \big((z_1-z_2-\theta_1\theta_2,\theta_1-\theta_2);\\
&\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad \mathbf{0},(1,\mathbf{0}),(1,\mathbf{0})\big)\\
(4.17)\qquad &= \big((z_1,\theta_1);\mathbf{0},(1,\mathbf{0}),(1,\mathbf{0})\big)\ {}_2\infty_0\ \big((z_2,\theta_2);\mathbf{0},(1,\mathbf{0}),(1,\mathbf{0})\big).
\end{aligned}$$

PROOF. Because each supersphere involved in the proposition has standard local coordinates at each puncture, the sewings depend only on the bodies of the superspheres. The sewing of the bodies is exactly the sewing given in Proposition 2.5.3 in [**H2**]. Thus as in Proposition 2.5.3 of [**H2**] there exist $r_1, ..., r_9 \in \mathbb{R}_+$ which allow the above two sewings including the soul portions of the superspheres. Then (4.16) and (4.17) follow from the definition of the sewing operation on $SK(2)$. □

REMARK 4.9. Proposition 4.8 is used in [**B1**] to prove the associativity property for an $N = 1$ Neveu-Schwarz vertex operator superalgebra with odd formal variables obtained from an $N = 1$ supergeometric vertex operator superalgebra. Thus Proposition 4.8 can be thought of as a geometric version of this algebraic relation.

Let $(a, m) \in \bigwedge_\infty^\infty$, and $k, l \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, and define

$$\begin{aligned}
\big(A(a,k), M(m,l-1/2)\big) = \Big(&\big\{A_j \mid A_k = a,\ A_j = 0,\ \text{for } j\neq k\big\}_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+},\\
&\big\{M_{j-\frac{1}{2}} \mid M_{l-\frac{1}{2}} = m,\ M_{j-\frac{1}{2}} = 0,\ \text{for } j\neq l\big\}_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}\Big)
\end{aligned}$$

which is an element of $\bigwedge_\infty^\infty$.

PROPOSITION 4.10. *For* $(z,\theta),(z_0,\theta_0) \in \bigwedge_\infty$ *such that* $0 < |(z_0)_B| < |z_B|$, *we have*

$$\begin{aligned}
&\big((z_0+z+\theta_0\theta,\theta+\theta_0);\mathbf{0},(1,\mathbf{0}),(1,\mathbf{0})\big) = \\
&\qquad\big((z,\theta);\mathbf{0},(1,\mathbf{0}),(1,\mathbf{0})\big)\ {}_1\infty_0\ \big((A(-z_0,1),M(-\theta_0,1/2)),(1,\mathbf{0})\big).
\end{aligned}$$

PROOF. Note that $(A(-z_0,1),M(-\theta_0,1/2)) \in \mathcal{H}^{(0)}$, and thus

$$((A(-z_0,1),M(-\theta_0,1/2)),(1,\mathbf{0})) \in SK(1).$$

In fact, $((A(-z_0,1),M(-\theta_0,1/2)),(1,\mathbf{0}))$ represents the equivalence class of superspheres with $1+1$ tubes with canonical supersphere having local coordinates (in terms of the coordinate chart about zero of the underlying super-Riemann sphere) at ∞ given by

$$(w,\rho)\mapsto\Big(\frac{1}{w+z_0+\rho\theta_0},\frac{i(\rho+\theta_0)}{w+z_0+\rho\theta_0}\Big) = \Big(\frac{1}{w+z_0}-\frac{\rho\theta_0}{(w+z_0)^2},\frac{i(\rho+\theta_0)}{w+z_0}\Big),$$

and at 0 given by $(w,\rho)\mapsto(w,\rho)$. This canonical supersphere with tubes is superconformally equivalent to the super-Riemann sphere with the negatively oriented puncture still at ∞, the positively oriented puncture at (z_0,θ_0), and with standard local coordinates at these punctures, i.e., the local coordinate at ∞ is given by $(w,\rho)\mapsto(1/w, i\rho/w)$ and the local coordinate at (z_0,θ_0) is given by the superconformal shift $s_{(z_0,\theta_0)} : (w,\rho)\mapsto(w-z_0-\rho\theta_0,\rho-\theta_0)$. Call this non-canonical supersphere C. Then choosing $r, r_1, r_2 \in \mathbb{R}_+$ such that $0 < |(z_0)_B| < r_2 < r < r_1 < |z_B|$, we can sew the 0-th puncture of C to the 1-st puncture of $((z,\theta);\mathbf{0},(1,\mathbf{0}),(1,\mathbf{0}))$ via the sewing defined in Chapter 2. The resulting supersphere C' is given by

$$C' = \Big((S\hat{\mathbb{C}} \setminus \Delta^{-1}(\bar{\mathcal{B}}^{r_2}_{(z,\theta)})) \sqcup (S\hat{\mathbb{C}} \setminus \Upsilon^{-1}(\bar{\mathcal{B}}_0^{1/r_1}))\Big)/\sim$$

where $p \sim q$ if

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta(p) = (w_1,\rho_1) \quad &\in \quad (\bar{\mathcal{B}}^{r_1}_{(z,\theta)} \setminus \bar{\mathcal{B}}^{r_2}_{(z,\theta)}) \subset (\textstyle\bigwedge_\infty \setminus \bar{\mathcal{B}}^{r_2}_{(z,\theta)})\\ \Delta(q) = (w_2,\rho_2) \quad &\in \quad (\bar{\mathcal{B}}^{r_2}_{\infty} \setminus \bar{\mathcal{B}}^{r_1}_{\infty}) \subset (\textstyle\bigwedge_\infty \setminus \bar{\mathcal{B}}^{r_1}_{\infty}),\end{aligned}$$

i.e.,

$$\Upsilon(q) = \Big(\frac{1}{w_2}, \frac{i\rho_2}{w_2}\Big) \in (\bar{\mathcal{B}}_0^{1/r_2} \setminus \bar{\mathcal{B}}_0^{1/r_1}) \subset (\textstyle\bigwedge_\infty \setminus \bar{\mathcal{B}}_0^{1/r_1}),$$

and $(w_1 - z - \rho_1\theta, \rho_1 - \theta) = (w_2,\rho_2)$. Then the uniformizing function which sends C' to a canonical super-Riemann sphere must satisfy

$$F(p) = \begin{cases} F^{(1)}(p) & \text{for } p \in (S\hat{\mathbb{C}} \setminus \Delta^{-1}(\bar{\mathcal{B}}^{r_2}_{(z,\theta)})),\\ F^{(2)}(p) & \text{for } p \in (S\hat{\mathbb{C}} \setminus \Upsilon^{-1}(\bar{\mathcal{B}}_0^{1/r_1})),\end{cases}$$

where $F^{(1)}_\Delta(w_1,\rho_1) = F^{(2)}_\Delta(w_2,\rho_2)$ if $\Delta^{-1}(w_1,\rho_1) \sim \Delta^{-1}(w_2,\rho_2)$, i.e., $F^{(1)}_\Delta(w,\rho) = F^{(2)}_\Delta(w - z - \rho\theta, \rho - \theta)$. In addition, we would like $F^{(1)}$ to send ∞ to ∞, send 0 to 0, and keep the even coefficient of w^{-2} of the local coordinate at ∞ equal to zero in order for the resulting supersphere to be canonical. Thus $F^{(1)}_\Delta(w,\rho) = (w,\rho)$ and $F^{(2)}_\Delta(w,\rho) = (w + z + \rho\theta, \rho + \theta)$ is a solution to the uniformizing function and is the unique solution sending C' to a canonical supersphere. Therefore the canonical supersphere representative of the equivalence class of the sewing

$$\big((z,\theta);\mathbf{0},(1,\mathbf{0}),(1,\mathbf{0})\big)\ {}_1\infty_0\ \big((A(-z_0,1),M(-\theta_0,1/2)),(1,\mathbf{0})\big)$$

is given by

$$\big(S\hat{\mathbb{C}};\infty, F^{(2)}_\Delta(z_0,\theta_0), 0; I, s_{(z_0,\theta_0)} \circ (F^{(2)}_\Delta)^{-1}, id_{\bigwedge_\infty}\big),$$

but this is the canonical supersphere represented by

$$\big((z_0 + z + \theta_0\theta, \theta + \theta_0);\mathbf{0},(1,\mathbf{0}),(1,\mathbf{0})\big)$$

as desired. □

Let $\epsilon \in \bigwedge^1_\infty$. From the definition of $SK(0)$, we see that $(\mathbf{0}, M(\epsilon,3/2)) \in SK(0)$. Let F be any element of $SD(1)$, and $(z,\theta) \in \bigwedge_\infty$. We define a linear functional on $SD(1)$ by

$$\mathcal{G}_e(z,\theta)F = \frac{d}{d\epsilon}F\Big(\big((z,\theta);\mathbf{0},(1,\mathbf{0}),(1,\mathbf{0})\big)\ {}_1\infty_0\ \big(\mathbf{0},M(\epsilon,3/2)\big)\Big)\Big|_{\epsilon=0}. \tag{4.18}$$

PROPOSITION 4.11. *The linear functional $\mathcal{G}_e(z,\theta)$ is in $T_eSK(1)$, and*

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{G}_e(z,\theta) = \sum_{k=0}^{1}\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+} & z^{-(2k-1)j-2+k}\frac{\partial}{\partial M^{(k)}_{j-\frac{1}{2}}}\bigg|_e\\ &+\ 2\theta\left(z^{-2}\frac{1}{2}\frac{\partial}{\partial a^{(1)}_{\square}}\bigg|_e + \sum_{k=0}^{1}\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+} z^{-(2k-1)j-2}\frac{\partial}{\partial A^{(k)}_j}\bigg|_e\right).\end{aligned} \tag{4.19}$$

PROOF. If $\mathcal{G}_e(z,\theta)$ is given by (4.19), then $\mathcal{G}_e(z,\theta) \in T_eSK(1)$. Thus, the only thing we need to prove is (4.19). The canonical supersphere $(\mathbf{0}, M(\epsilon, 3/2))$ is the super-Riemann sphere with one puncture at ∞ and local coordinate at ∞ given by

$$\begin{aligned}
\exp\Bigg(-\epsilon w^{-1}\bigg(\frac{\partial}{\partial\rho} - \rho\frac{\partial}{\partial w}\bigg)\Bigg) \cdot \bigg(\frac{1}{w}, \frac{i\rho}{w}\bigg)
&= \exp\Bigg(-i\epsilon x^2\bigg(\frac{\partial}{\partial\varphi} - \varphi\frac{\partial}{\partial x}\bigg)\Bigg) \cdot (x,\varphi)\bigg|_{(x,\varphi)=\left(\frac{1}{w}, \frac{i\rho}{w}\right)} \\
&= \bigg(\frac{1}{w} - \frac{\epsilon\rho}{w^3}, \frac{i\rho}{w} - \frac{i\epsilon}{w^2}\bigg).
\end{aligned} \tag{4.20}$$

Define $A_j^{(0)}(\epsilon), A_j^{(1)}(\epsilon) \in \bigwedge_\infty^0$, and $M_{j-\frac{1}{2}}^{(0)}(\epsilon), M_{j-\frac{1}{2}}^{(1)}(\epsilon) \in \bigwedge_\infty^1$, for $j \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, and $a_\square^{(1)}(\epsilon) \in (\bigwedge_\infty^0)^\times$ by

$$\begin{aligned}
&\bigg(\frac{1}{w} + \frac{2\epsilon\theta}{wz(w-z)} + \frac{\rho\epsilon}{wz(w-z)}, \frac{-i\epsilon}{w(w-z)} - \frac{i\epsilon}{wz} \\
&\qquad\qquad + \rho\bigg(\frac{i}{w} + \frac{i\epsilon\theta}{w(w-z)^2} + \frac{2i\epsilon\theta}{wz(w-z)}\bigg)\bigg) \\
&\quad = \exp\Bigg(\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}\Big(A_j^{(0)}(\epsilon)L_{-j}(w,\rho) + M_{j-\frac{1}{2}}^{(0)}(\epsilon)G_{-j+\frac{1}{2}}(w,\rho)\Big)\Bigg) \cdot \bigg(\frac{1}{w}, \frac{i\rho}{w}\bigg),
\end{aligned} \tag{4.21}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
&\bigg(w - \frac{2\epsilon\theta}{w-z} - \frac{2\epsilon\theta}{z} - \rho\bigg(\frac{\epsilon}{w-z} + \frac{\epsilon}{z}\bigg), \frac{-\epsilon}{w-z} - \frac{\epsilon}{z} + \rho\bigg(1 + \frac{\epsilon\theta}{(w-z)^2}\bigg)\bigg) \\
&\quad = \exp\Bigg(-\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}\Big(A_j^{(1)}(\epsilon)L_j(w,\rho) + M_{j-\frac{1}{2}}^{(1)}(\epsilon)G_{j-\frac{1}{2}}(w,\rho)\Big)\Bigg) \cdot \\
&\qquad\qquad \cdot (a_\square^{(1)}(\epsilon))^{-2L_0(w,\rho)} \cdot (w,\rho).
\end{aligned} \tag{4.22}$$

By definition of the sewing operation,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\big((z,\theta); \mathbf{0}, (1,\mathbf{0}), (1,\mathbf{0})\big)\ {}_1\infty_0\ \big(\mathbf{0}, M(\epsilon, 3/2)\big) \\
&\qquad = \big((A^{(0)}(\epsilon), M^{(0)}(\epsilon)), (a_\square^{(1)}(\epsilon), A^{(1)}(\epsilon), M^{(1)}(\epsilon))\big).
\end{aligned} \tag{4.23}$$

Let $F_0, F_j^{(0)}, F_j^{(1)} \in SD^0(0)$, and $F_{j-1/2}^{(0)}, F_{j-1/2}^{(1)} \in SD^1(0)$, for $j \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, be given by

$$\begin{aligned}
F_0((A^{(0)}, M^{(0)}), (a_\square^{(1)}, A^{(1)}, M^{(1)})) &= a_\square^{(1)}, \\
F_j^{(0)}((A^{(0)}, M^{(0)}), (a_\square^{(1)}, A^{(1)}, M^{(1)})) &= A_j^{(0)}, \\
F_j^{(1)}((A^{(0)}, M^{(0)}), (a_\square^{(1)}, A^{(1)}, M^{(1)})) &= A_j^{(1)}, \\
F_{j-\frac{1}{2}}^{(0)}((A^{(0)}, M^{(0)}), (a_\square^{(1)}, A^{(1)}, M^{(1)})) &= M_{j-\frac{1}{2}}^{(0)}, \\
F_{j-\frac{1}{2}}^{(1)}((A^{(0)}, M^{(0)}), (a_\square^{(1)}, A^{(1)}, M^{(1)})) &= M_{j-\frac{1}{2}}^{(1)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{d}{d\epsilon}F_0((A^{(0)},M^{(0)}),(a_{\square}^{(1)},A^{(1)},M^{(1)}))\bigg|_{\epsilon=0} &= \frac{d}{d\epsilon}a_{\square}^{(1)}(\epsilon)\bigg|_{\epsilon=0},\\
\frac{d}{d\epsilon}F_j^{(0)}((A^{(0)},M^{(0)}),(a_{\square}^{(1)},A^{(1)},M^{(1)}))\bigg|_{\epsilon=0} &= \frac{d}{d\epsilon}A_j^{(0)}(\epsilon)\bigg|_{\epsilon=0},\\
\frac{d}{d\epsilon}F_j^{(1)}((A^{(0)},M^{(0)}),(a_{\square}^{(1)},A^{(1)},M^{(1)}))\bigg|_{\epsilon=0} &= \frac{d}{d\epsilon}A_j^{(1)}(\epsilon)\bigg|_{\epsilon=0},\\
\frac{d}{d\epsilon}F_{j-\frac{1}{2}}^{(0)}((A^{(0)},M^{(0)}),(a_{\square}^{(1)},A^{(1)},M^{(1)}))\bigg|_{\epsilon=0} &= \frac{d}{d\epsilon}M_{j-\frac{1}{2}}^{(0)}(\epsilon)\bigg|_{\epsilon=0},\\
\frac{d}{d\epsilon}F_{j-\frac{1}{2}}^{(1)}((A^{(0)},M^{(0)}),(a_{\square}^{(1)},A^{(1)},M^{(1)}))\bigg|_{\epsilon=0} &= \frac{d}{d\epsilon}M_{j-\frac{1}{2}}^{(1)}(\epsilon)\bigg|_{\epsilon=0}.
\end{aligned}$$

From (4.21) and (4.22), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{d}{d\epsilon}a_{\square}^{(1)}(\epsilon)\bigg|_{\epsilon=0} &= \theta z^{-2},\\
\frac{d}{d\epsilon}A_j^{(0)}(\epsilon)\bigg|_{\epsilon=0} &= 2\theta z^{j-2},\\
\frac{d}{d\epsilon}A_j^{(1)}(\epsilon)\bigg|_{\epsilon=0} &= 2\theta z^{-j-2},\\
\frac{d}{d\epsilon}M_{j-\frac{1}{2}}^{(0)}(\epsilon)\bigg|_{\epsilon=0} &= z^{j-2},\\
\frac{d}{d\epsilon}M_{j-\frac{1}{2}}^{(1)}(\epsilon)\bigg|_{\epsilon=0} &= z^{-j-1},
\end{aligned}$$

for $j \in \mathbb{Z}_+$. Using (4.18), (4.23) and the above formulas, we obtain (4.19). □

Remark 4.12. Propositions 4.10 and 4.11 are used in [**B1**] to prove certain axioms for an $N = 1$ Neveu-Schwarz vertex operator superalgebra constructed from an $N = 1$ supergeometric vertex operator superalgebra. The axioms proved using these propositions are: that the vertex operator with formal variables associated with the Neveu-Schwarz element τ is equal to the formal series with coefficients satisfying the Neveu-Schwarz algebra relations; and the $G(-1/2)$-derivative property. One can thus derive some motivation for looking at the functional $\mathcal{G}_e(z,\theta)$ by noting that the local coordinate (4.20) which is given by

$$\exp\Big(\epsilon G_{-\frac{1}{2}}(w,\rho)\Big)\cdot\left(\frac{1}{w},\frac{i\rho}{w}\right)$$

is related to the algebraic aspects of $N = 1$ superconformal field theory via the fact that in an $N = 1$ Neveu-Schwarz vertex operator superalgebra [**B3**], the Neveu-Schwarz element τ is given by $G(-1/2)\mathbf{1}$ where $\mathbf{1}$ is the vacuum element and $G(-1/2)$ is given by the representation of the $N = 1$ Neveu-Schwarz algebra present in the $N = 1$ Neveu-Schwarz vertex operator superalgebra. In the correspondence between the algebra and geometry, the supersphere represented by $(\mathbf{0}) \in SK(0)$ corresponds to the vacuum element $\mathbf{1}$ in the vertex operator superalgebra, and $(\mathbf{0}, M(\epsilon, 3/2))$ corresponds to $e^{\epsilon G(-1/2)}\mathbf{1}$. Therefore taking the partial derivative with respect to ϵ and setting $\epsilon = 0$, one obtains the Neveu-Schwarz element. Then the linear functional $\mathcal{G}_e(z,\theta)$ acting on the supermeromorphic function corresponding to the one-point correlation function gives the correlation function of the vertex operator associated to the Neveu-Schwarz element τ, denoted $\langle v', Y(\tau,(z,\theta))v\rangle$; see [**B1**], [**B3**].

4.5. Generalized superspheres with tubes

From Proposition 4.7, we know that for any $(A,M) \in \mathcal{H}$, the sets

$$\big\{(\mathbf{0},(1,t(A,M)) \mid t \in {\textstyle\bigwedge}_\infty^0,\ t(A,M) \in \mathcal{H}\big\} \tag{4.24}$$

$$\big\{(t(A,M),(1,\mathbf{0})) \mid t \in {\textstyle\bigwedge}_\infty^0,\ t(A,M) \in \mathcal{H}\big\} \tag{4.25}$$

are subgroups of $SK(1)$, as are the corresponding sets if we restrict to $A = \mathbf{0}$ or $M = \mathbf{0}$. If we consider

$$\big\{(\mathbf{0},(1,t(A,M)) \mid t \in {\textstyle\bigwedge}_\infty^0,\ (A,M) \in {\textstyle\bigwedge}_\infty^\infty\big\} \tag{4.26}$$

$$\big\{(t(A,M),(1,\mathbf{0})) \mid t \in {\textstyle\bigwedge}_\infty^0,\ (A,M) \in {\textstyle\bigwedge}_\infty^\infty\big\} \tag{4.27}$$

then these sets are $(1,0)$-dimensional super Lie groups over $\bigwedge_\infty$, i.e., they are abstract groups which are also $(1,0)$-dimensional superanalytic supermanifolds with superanalytic group multiplication and inverse mappings, (cf. [**Ro1**]). But elements of (4.26) and (4.27) are in general not in $SK(1)$, even if $(A,M) \in \mathcal{H}$. Therefore, in order to study these sets, we introduce generalized superspheres with tubes.

Let

$$\tilde{SK}(n) = SM^{n-1} \times {\textstyle\bigwedge}_\infty^\infty \times (({\textstyle\bigwedge}_\infty^0)^\times \times {\textstyle\bigwedge}_\infty^\infty)^n,$$

for $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, and

$$\tilde{SK}(0) = \big\{\,(A,M) \in {\textstyle\bigwedge}_\infty^\infty \mid\ (A_1, M_{\frac{1}{2}}) = (0,0)\big\}.$$

Elements of $\tilde{SK} = \bigcup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \tilde{SK}(n)$ are called *generalized* (or *formal*) *superspheres with tubes*. Note that $SK \subset \tilde{SK}$. From the definition of supermeromorphic superfunction on SK, the following generalization is obvious:

PROPOSITION 4.13. *Any supermeromorphic superfunction on $SK(n)$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, can be extended to a superfunction on $\tilde{SK}(n)$ having the same form.*

Let $Q_1 \in \tilde{SK}(n)$, for $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, be given by

$$((z_1,\theta_1),...,(z_{n-1},\theta_{n-1}); (A^{(0)},M^{(0)}), (a_\square^{(1)},A^{(1)},M^{(1)}),...,(a_\square^{(n)},A^{(n)},M^{(n)})),$$

and let $Q_2 = (\mathbf{0},(b_\square^{(1)},B^{(1)},N^{(1)}))$ be an element of $\tilde{SK}(1)$. Let

$$(B^{(1)}(a_\square^{(i)}), N^{(1)}(a_\square^{(i)})) = \Big\{(a_\square^{(i)})^{2j}B_j^{(1)}, (a_\square^{(i)})^{2j-1}N_{j-\frac{1}{2}}^{(1)}\Big\}_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+} \in {\textstyle\bigwedge}_\infty^\infty.$$

We define

$$\begin{aligned} Q_1 \ {}_i\infty_0\ Q_2 = \Big(&(z_1,\theta_1),...,(z_{n-1},\theta_{n-1}); (A^{(0)},M^{(0)}), (a_\square^{(1)},A^{(1)},M^{(1)}),...,\\ &(a_\square^{(i-1)},A^{(i-1)},M^{(i-1)}), (a_\square^{(i)}b_\square^{(1)}, (A^{(i)},M^{(i)}) \circ (B^{(1)}(a_\square^{(i)}), N^{(1)}(a_\square^{(i)}))),\\ &(a_\square^{(i+1)},A^{(i+1)},M^{(i+1)}),...,(a_\square^{(n)},A^{(n)},M^{(n)})\Big) \in \tilde{SK}(n). \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, for $Q_3 = ((B^{(0)}, N^{(0)}), (1, \mathbf{0})) \in \tilde{SK}(1)$, we define

$$\begin{aligned} Q_3 \;{}_1\infty_0\; Q_1 = ((z_1, \theta_1), ..., (z_{n-1}, \theta_{n-1}); (A^{(0)}, M^{(0)}) \circ (B^{(0)}, N^{(0)}), \\ (a_\square^{(1)}, A^{(1)}, M^{(1)}), ..., (a_\square^{(n)}, A^{(n)}, M^{(n)})) \;\in \tilde{SK}(n). \end{aligned}$$

Proposition 4.14. *The subsets*

$$\tilde{SK}^0(1) = \{(\mathbf{0}, (a_\square^{(1)}, A^{(1)}, M^{(1)})) \in \tilde{SK}(1)\}$$

and

$$\tilde{SK}^\infty(1) = \{((A^{(0)}, M^{(0)}), (1, \mathbf{0})) \in \tilde{SK}(1)\}$$

with the sewing operation ${}_1\infty_0$ *as defined above are groups. If* $(A, M) \in \bigwedge_\infty^\infty$ *and* $a_\square \in (\bigwedge_\infty^0)^\times$*, then*

$$\begin{aligned} t &\mapsto (\mathbf{0}, (a_\square^t, \mathbf{0})) \\ t &\mapsto (\mathbf{0}, (1, t(A, M))) \end{aligned}$$

give homomorphisms from the additive group $\bigwedge_\infty^0$ *to* $\tilde{SK}^0(1)$*, and*

$$t \mapsto (t(A, M), (1, \mathbf{0}))$$

gives a homomorphism from $\bigwedge_\infty^0$ *to* $\tilde{SK}^\infty(1)$*. In addition, we have the subgroups obtained by setting* $a_\square^{(1)} = 1$*,* $A^{(1)} = \mathbf{0}$*,* $M^{(1)} = \mathbf{0}$*,* $A^{(0)} = \mathbf{0}$*, or* $M^{(0)} = \mathbf{0}$*.*

Proof. From the definition of the sewing operation defined above, $\tilde{SK}^0(1)$ and $\tilde{SK}^\infty(1)$ are closed under ${}_1\infty_0$. The identity for both $\tilde{SK}^0(1)$ and $\tilde{SK}^\infty(1)$ is

$$e = (\mathbf{0}, (1, \mathbf{0})).$$

In $\tilde{SK}^0(1)$, the inverse of $(\mathbf{0}, (a_\square^{(1)}, A^{(1)}, M^{(1)}))$ is

$$(\mathbf{0}, ((a_\square^{(1)})^{-1}, -A^{(1)}((a_\square^{(1)})^{-1}), -M^{(1)}((a_\square^{(1)})^{-1})),$$

and in $\tilde{SK}^\infty(1)$, the inverse of $((A^{(0)}, M^{(0)}), (1, \mathbf{0}))$ is $((-A^{(0)}, -M^{(0)}), (1, \mathbf{0}))$.

From the definition of the sewing operation, Proposition 3.15 and equation (3.34), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \big(\mathbf{0}, (a_\square^{t_1}, t_1(A, M))) \;{}_1\infty_0\; (\mathbf{0}, (a_\square^{t_2}, t_2(A, M))\big) = \\ \big(\mathbf{0}, (a_\square^{t_1} a_\square^{t_2}, t_1(A, M) \circ t_2(A(a_\square^{t_1}), M(a_\square^{t_1})))\big). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore

$$\big(\mathbf{0}, (a_\square^{t_1}, \mathbf{0})) \;{}_1\infty_0\; (\mathbf{0}, (a_\square^{t_2}, \mathbf{0})\big) = \big(\mathbf{0}, (a_\square^{t_1+t_2}, \mathbf{0})\big)$$

and

$$(\mathbf{0}, (1, t_1(A, M))) \;{}_1\infty_0\; (\mathbf{0}, (1, t_2(A, M))) = (\mathbf{0}, (1, (t_1 + t_2)(A, M)))\,.$$

Thus $t \mapsto (\mathbf{0}, (a_\square^t, \mathbf{0}))$ and $t \mapsto (\mathbf{0}, (1, t(A, M))$ are homomorphisms from $\bigwedge_\infty^0$ to $\tilde{SK}^0(1)$. In addition,

$$\begin{aligned} (t_1(A, M), (1, \mathbf{0})) \;{}_1\infty_0\; (t_2(A, M), (1, \mathbf{0})) &= (t_1(A, M) \circ t_2(A, M), (1, \mathbf{0})) \\ &= ((t_1 + t_2)(A, M), (1, \mathbf{0}))\,. \end{aligned}$$

Thus $t \mapsto (t(A, M), (1, \mathbf{0}))$ is a homomorphism from $\bigwedge_\infty^0$ to $\tilde{SK}^\infty(1)$. □

Remark 4.15. The group $\tilde{SK}^0(1)$ is isomorphic to the group $(\bigwedge_\infty^0)^\times \times \bigwedge_\infty^\infty$ discussed in Remark 3.16 with $R = \bigwedge_\infty$. The group $\tilde{SK}^\infty(1)$ and the subgroup of $\tilde{SK}^0(1)$ given by $\{(\mathbf{0}, (1, A^{(1)}, M^{(1)})) \in \tilde{SK}^0(1)\}$ are both isomorphic to the subgroup $\bigwedge_\infty^\infty$ of $(\bigwedge_\infty^0)^\times \times \bigwedge_\infty^\infty$. The subset $(\bigwedge_\infty^0)^\times \times \mathcal{H}$ is a subgroup of $(\bigwedge_\infty^0)^\times \times \bigwedge_\infty^\infty$ and is isomorphic to the subgroup of all elements of $\tilde{SK}^0(1)$ with $(A^{(1)}, M^{(1)}) \in \mathcal{H}$. This subgroup is also isomorphic to the group of local superconformal transformations vanishing at 0. Similarly, the subset $\mathcal{H}$ is a subgroup of $\bigwedge_\infty^\infty$ isomorphic to the subgroup of all elements of $\tilde{SK}^\infty(1)$ with $(A^{(0)}, M^{(0)}) \in \mathcal{H}$. This subgroup is isomorphic to the group of local superconformal transformations vanishing at ∞.

4.6. The sewing formulas and the convergence of associated series via the Fischer-Grauert Theorem

For $m \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, let $Q_1 \in SK(m)$ be given by

$$\big((z_1, \theta_1), ..., (z_{m-1}, \theta_{m-1}); (A^{(0)}, M^{(0)}), (a_\square^{(1)}, A^{(1)}, M^{(1)}), ..., (a_\square^{(m)}, A^{(m)}, M^{(m)})\big)$$

and for $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $Q_2 \in SK(n)$ be given by

$$\big((z_1', \theta_1'), ..., (z_{n-1}', \theta_{n-1}'); (B^{(0)}, N^{(0)}), (b_\square^{(1)}, B^{(1)}, N^{(1)}), ..., (b_\square^{(n)}, B^{(n)}, N^{(n)})\big).$$

For convenience, we will sometimes denote the puncture at 0 of Q_1 by (z_m, θ_m).

Let

$$\begin{aligned} H^{(1)}(w, \rho) &= \exp\Bigg(-\sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}_+}\bigg(A_j^{(i)} L_j(w, \rho) + M_{j-\frac{1}{2}}^{(i)} G_{j-\frac{1}{2}}(w, \rho)\bigg)\Bigg) \cdot \\ &\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad \cdot (a_\square^{(i)})^{-2L_0(w,\rho)} \cdot (w, \rho) \\ &= \hat{E}(a_\square^{(i)}, A^{(i)}, M^{(i)})(w, \rho), \\ H^{(2)}(w, \rho) &= \exp\Bigg(\sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}_+}\bigg(B_j^{(0)} L_{-j}(w, \rho) + N_{j-\frac{1}{2}}^{(0)} G_{-j+\frac{1}{2}}(w, \rho)\bigg)\Bigg) \cdot \Big(\frac{1}{w}, \frac{i\rho}{w}\Big) \\ &= \tilde{E}(B^{(0)}, -iN^{(0)})\Big(\frac{1}{w}, \frac{i\rho}{w}\Big). \end{aligned}$$

Then the local coordinate vanishing at the i-th puncture of the canonical supersphere represented by Q_1 is $H^{(1)} \circ s_{(z_i, \theta_i)}(w, \rho)$, and the local coordinate vanishing at the puncture at ∞ of the canonical supersphere represented by Q_1 is $H^{(2)}(w, \rho)$.

Recall the standard coordinate atlas for the super-Riemann sphere, $S\hat{\mathbb{C}}$, given by $\{(U_\Delta, \Delta), (U_\Upsilon, \Upsilon)\}$ with coordinate transition given by $I = \Delta \circ \Upsilon^{-1}$.

Proposition 4.16. *The i-th tube of Q_1 can be sewn with the 0-th tube of Q_2 if and only if there exist $r_1, r_2 \in \mathbb{R}_+$, with $r_1 > r_2$ such that the series $(H^{(1)})^{-1}(w, \rho)$ and $(H^{(2)})^{-1}(w, \rho)$ are absolutely convergent and single-valued in $\mathcal{B}_0^{r_1}$ and $\mathcal{B}_0^{1/r_2} \smallsetminus (\{0\} \times (\bigwedge_\infty)_S)$, respectively,*

$$(-z_i, -\theta_i), (z_k - z_i - \theta_k\theta_i, \theta_k - \theta_i) \notin (H^{(1)})^{-1}(\mathcal{B}_0^{r_1}),$$

for $k = 1, ..., m-1$, $k \neq i$, and

$$0, (z_l', \theta_l') \notin (H^{(2)})^{-1}(\mathcal{B}_0^{1/r_2} \smallsetminus (\{0\} \times (\bigwedge_\infty)_S)),$$

for $l = 1, ..., n-1$. Moreover, in this case, there exist unique bijective superconformal functions $F^{(1)}(w, \rho)$ and $F^{(2)}(w, \rho)$ defined on

$$S\hat{\mathbb{C}} \smallsetminus \Delta^{-1} \circ s^{-1}_{(z_i,\theta_i)} \circ (H^{(1)})^{-1}(\bar{\mathcal{B}}_0^{r_2})$$

and

$$U_\Delta \smallsetminus \Delta^{-1} \circ (H^{(2)})^{-1}(\bar{\mathcal{B}}_0^{1/r_1} \smallsetminus (\{0\} \times (\bigwedge\nolimits_\infty)_S)) \subset S\hat{\mathbb{C}},$$

respectively, satisfying the normalization conditions:

$$F_\Upsilon^{(1)}(0) = 0, \tag{4.28}$$

$$\lim_{w\to\infty} \frac{\partial}{\partial \rho}(F_\Delta^{(1)})^1(w, \rho) = 1 \tag{4.29}$$

$$F_\Delta^{(2)}(0) = 0 \tag{4.30}$$

and such that in $(H^{(1)} \circ s_{(z_i,\theta_i)})^{-1}(\mathcal{B}_0^{r_1} \smallsetminus \bar{\mathcal{B}}_0^{r_2})$, we have [1]

$$F_\Delta^{(1)}(w, \rho) = F_\Delta^{(2)} \circ (H^{(2)})^{-1} \circ I \circ H^{(1)} \circ s_{(z_i,\theta_i)}(w, \rho). \tag{4.31}$$

Furthermore, if we let

$$H_0^{(1)}(w, \rho) = \tilde{E}(A^{(0)}, -iM^{(0)})\Big(\frac{1}{w}, \frac{i\rho}{w}\Big),$$

denote the local coordinate of the puncture vanishing at ∞ of the canonical supersphere represented by Q_1; let

$$H_k^{(1)}(w, \rho) = \hat{E}(a_\square^{(k)}, A^{(k)}, M^{(k)})(w, \rho),$$

so that the local coordinate vanishing at the k-th puncture of the canonical supersphere represented by Q_1 is given by $H_k^{(1)} \circ s_{(z_k,\theta_k)}$, for $k = 1, ..., m$, $k \neq i$; and let

$$H_l^{(2)}(w, \rho) = \hat{E}(b_\square^{(l)}, B^{(l)}, N^{(l)})(w, \rho),$$

so that the local coordinate vanishing at the l-th puncture of the canonical supersphere represented by Q_2 is given by $H_l^{(2)} \circ s_{(z'_l,\theta'_l)}$, for $l = 1, ..., n$; then we have the following: [2]

(1) When $i = m$, and $n > 0$, the punctures of the canonical supersphere represented by $Q_1\ {}_m\infty_0\ Q_2$ are

$$\infty,\ F_\Delta^{(1)}(z_1, \theta_1), ..., F_\Delta^{(1)}(z_{m-1}, \theta_{m-1}),\ F_\Delta^{(2)}(z'_1, \theta'_1), ..., F_\Delta^{(2)}(z'_{n-1}, \theta'_{n-1}),\ 0;$$

---

[1] There is a misprint in the analogous nonsuper case given in [**H2**]. The domain of the sewing equation in Proposition 3.4.1 in [**H2**] is $(f^{(1)})^{-1}(B^{r_1} \smallsetminus \bar{B}^{r_2}) + z_i$, not $(f^{(2)})^{-1}(B^{1/r_2} \smallsetminus \bar{B}^{1/r_1})$, as stated. Corrected, this corresponds to the projection onto the body of $s^{-1}_{(z_i,\theta_i)} \circ (H^{(1)})^{-1}(\mathcal{B}_0^{r_1} \smallsetminus \bar{\mathcal{B}}_0^{r_2})$.

[2] The analogous nonsuper case to the sewing formulas (1)–(5) are given in [**H2**] on pp.78–79 and pp.189–191. However, the functions listed as "local coordinate maps vanishing at the punctures" are actually the local coordinates normalized to vanish at zero. That is, if we let g_k, for $k = 1, ..., m+n-1$, denote the local coordinates vanishing at the puncture z_k of the resulting sewn canonical sphere, in each of the cases (1)–(5) in [**H2**], the functions listed are $g_0(1/x)$, $g_k(x + z_k)$, for $k = 1, ..., m+n-2$, and $g_{m+n-1}(x)$ for x a complex variable. However, the actual formulas given for $Q_1\ {}_i\infty_0\ Q_2 \in K(m + n - 1)$ in Appendix A of [**H2**] are correct.

and the local coordinates vanishing at these punctures are

$$\begin{gathered}
H_0^{(1)} \circ (F_\Delta^{(1)})^{-1}(w,\rho),\\
H_1^{(1)} \circ s_{(z_1,\theta_1)} \circ (F_\Delta^{(1)})^{-1}(w,\rho), ..., H_{m-1}^{(1)} \circ s_{(z_{m-1},\theta_{m-1})} \circ (F_\Delta^{(1)})^{-1}(w,\rho),\\
H_1^{(2)} \circ s_{(z_1',\theta_1')} \circ (F_\Delta^{(2)})^{-1}(w,\rho), ..., H_{n-1}^{(2)} \circ s_{(z_{n-1}',\theta_{n-1}')} \circ (F_\Delta^{(2)})^{-1}(w,\rho)\\
H_n^{(2)} \circ (F_\Delta^{(2)})^{-1}(w,\rho),
\end{gathered}$$

respectively. Thus

$$\begin{aligned}
&Q_1 \, {}_m\infty_0 \, Q_2\\
&\quad = \Big(F_\Delta^{(1)}(z_1,\theta_1), ..., F_\Delta^{(1)}(z_{m-1},\theta_{m-1}), F_\Delta^{(2)}(z_1',\theta_1'), ..., F_\Delta^{(2)}(z_{n-1}',\theta_{n-1}');\\
&\quad \big((\tilde{E}^{-1})^0(H_0^{(1)} \circ (F_\Delta^{(1)})^{-1} \circ I^{-1}(w,\rho)), i(\tilde{E}^{-1})^1(H_0^{(1)} \circ (F_\Delta^{(1)})^{-1} \circ I^{-1}(w,\rho))\big),\\
&\qquad \hat{E}^{-1}(H_1^{(1)} \circ s_{(z_1,\theta_1)} \circ (F_\Delta^{(1)})^{-1} \circ s^{-1}_{F_\Delta^{(1)}(z_1,\theta_1)}(w,\rho)), ...,\\
&\qquad \hat{E}^{-1}(H_{m-1}^{(1)} \circ s_{(z_{m-1},\theta_{m-1})} \circ (F_\Delta^{(1)})^{-1} \circ s^{-1}_{F_\Delta^{(1)}(z_{m-1},\theta_{m-1})}(w,\rho)),\\
&\qquad \hat{E}^{-1}(H_1^{(2)} \circ s_{(z_1',\theta_1')} \circ (F_\Delta^{(2)})^{-1} \circ s^{-1}_{F_\Delta^{(2)}(z_1',\theta_1')}(w,\rho)), ...,\\
&\qquad \hat{E}^{-1}(H_{n-1}^{(2)} \circ s_{(z_{n-1}',\theta_{n-1}')} \circ (F_\Delta^{(2)})^{-1} \circ s^{-1}_{F_\Delta^{(2)}(z_{n-1}',\theta_{n-1}')}(w,\rho)),\\
&\qquad\qquad \hat{E}^{-1}(H_n^{(2)} \circ (F_\Delta^{(2)})^{-1}(w,\rho))\Big),
\end{aligned}$$

(2) When $i = m = 1$ and $n = 0$, the canonical supersphere represented by $Q_1 \, {}_1\infty_0 \, Q_2$ has only the one puncture at ∞ with local coordinate given by

$$H_0^{(1)} \circ (F_\Delta^{(1)})^{-1} \circ s^{-1}_{(a',m')}(w,\rho), \tag{4.32}$$

where $(a',m') \in \bigwedge_\infty$ is the unique element such that $Q_1 \, {}_1\infty_0 \, Q_2$ represents a canonical supersphere in $SK(0)$, i.e., such that the expansion of (4.32) has even coefficient of w^{-2} and odd coefficient of w^{-1} equal to zero. Thus

$$\begin{aligned}
Q_1 \, {}_1\infty_0 \, Q_2 = \big(&(\tilde{E}^{-1})^0(H_0^{(1)} \circ (F_\Delta^{(1)})^{-1} \circ s^{-1}_{(a',m')} \circ I^{-1}(w,\rho)),\\
&\qquad i(\tilde{E}^{-1})^1(H_0^{(1)} \circ (F_\Delta^{(1)})^{-1} \circ s^{-1}_{(a',m')} \circ I^{-1}(w,\rho))\big).
\end{aligned}$$

(3) When $i = m > 1$, and $n = 0$, and writing $F_\Delta^{(1)}(z_{m-1},\theta_{m-1}) = p \in \bigwedge_\infty$, the punctures of the canonical supersphere represented by $Q_1 \, {}_i\infty_0 \, Q_2$ are

$$\infty, \; s_p \circ F_\Delta^{(1)}(z_1,\theta_1), ..., s_p \circ F_\Delta^{(1)}(z_{m-2},\theta_{m-2}), \; 0;$$

and the local coordinates vanishing at these punctures are

$$\begin{gathered}
H_0^{(1)} \circ (F_\Delta^{(1)})^{-1} \circ s_p^{-1}(w,\rho),\\
H_1^{(1)} \circ s_{(z_1,\theta_1)} \circ (F_\Delta^{(1)})^{-1} \circ s_p^{-1}(w,\rho), ..., H_{m-2}^{(1)} \circ s_{(z_{m-2},\theta_{m-2})} \circ (F_\Delta^{(1)})^{-1} \circ s_p^{-1}(w,\rho)\\
H_{m-1}^{(1)} \circ s_{(z_{m-1},\theta_{m-1})} \circ (F_\Delta^{(1)})^{-1} \circ s_p^{-1}(w,\rho),
\end{gathered}$$

respectively. Thus

$$\begin{aligned}Q_1\ {}_i\infty_0\ Q_2 = \Big(&s_p \circ F_\Delta^{(1)}(z_1, \theta_1), ..., s_p \circ F_\Delta^{(1)}(z_{m-2}, \theta_{m-2});\\ \big((\tilde{E}^{-1})^0(H_0^{(1)} \circ (F_\Delta^{(1)})^{-1} \circ s_p^{-1} \circ I^{-1}(w, \rho)), &i(\tilde{E}^{-1})^1(H_0^{(1)} \circ (F_\Delta^{(1)})^{-1} \circ s_p^{-1} \circ I^{-1}(w, \rho)\big),\\ &\hat{E}^{-1}(H_1^{(1)} \circ s_{(z_1, \theta_1)} \circ (F_\Delta^{(1)})^{-1} \circ s^{-1}_{F_\Delta^{(1)}(z_1, \theta_1)}(w, \rho)), ...,\\ &\hat{E}^{-1}(H_{m-2}^{(1)} \circ s_{(z_{m-2}, \theta_{m-2})} \circ (F_\Delta^{(1)})^{-1} \circ s^{-1}_{F_\Delta^{(1)}(z_{m-2}, \theta_{m-2})}(w, \rho)),\\ &\hat{E}^{-1}(H_{m-1}^{(1)} \circ s_{(z_{m-1}, \theta_{m-1})} \circ (F_\Delta^{(1)})^{-1} \circ s_p^{-1}(w, \rho))\Big)\end{aligned}$$

(4) When $i < m$ and $n \neq 0$, writing $F_\Delta^{(1)}(0) = p \in \bigwedge_\infty$, the punctures of the canonical supersphere represented by $Q_1\ {}_i\infty_0\ Q_2$ are

$$\begin{aligned}&\infty,\ s_p \circ F_\Delta^{(1)}(z_1, \theta_1), ..., s_p \circ F_\Delta^{(1)}(z_{i-1}, \theta_{i-1}),\ s_p \circ F_\Delta^{(2)}(z'_1, \theta'_1), ...,\\ &\qquad s_p \circ F_\Delta^{(2)}(z'_{n-1}, \theta'_{n-1}), -F_\Delta^{(1)}(0),\ s_p \circ F_\Delta^{(1)}(z_{i+1}, \theta_{i+1}), ...,\\ &\qquad\qquad s_p \circ F_\Delta^{(1)}(z_{m-1}, \theta_{m-1}),\ 0;\end{aligned}$$

and the local coordinates vanishing at these punctures are

$$\begin{gathered}H_0^{(1)} \circ (F_\Delta^{(1)})^{-1} \circ s_p^{-1}(w, \rho),\\ H_1^{(1)} \circ s_{(z_1, \theta_1)} \circ (F_\Delta^{(1)})^{-1} \circ s_p^{-1}(w, \rho), ..., H_{i-1}^{(1)} \circ s_{(z_{i-1}, \theta_{i-1})} \circ (F_\Delta^{(1)})^{-1} \circ s_p^{-1}(w, \rho),\\ H_1^{(2)} \circ s_{(z'_1, \theta'_1)} \circ (F_\Delta^{(2)})^{-1} \circ s_p^{-1}(w, \rho), ..., H_{n-1}^{(2)} \circ s_{(z'_{n-1}, \theta'_{n-1})} \circ (F_\Delta^{(2)})^{-1} \circ s_p^{-1}(w, \rho),\\ H_n^{(2)} \circ (F_\Delta^{(2)})^{-1} \circ s_p^{-1}(w, \rho),\\ H_{i+1}^{(1)} \circ s_{(z_{i+1}, \theta_{i+1})} \circ (F_\Delta^{(1)})^{-1} \circ s_p^{-1}(w, \rho), ...,\\ H_{m-1}^{(1)} \circ s_{(z_{m-1}, \theta_{m-1})} \circ (F_\Delta^{(1)})^{-1} \circ s_p^{-1}(w, \rho),\\ H_m^{(1)} \circ (F_\Delta^{(1)})^{-1} \circ s_p^{-1}(w, \rho),\end{gathered}$$

respectively. Thus

$$\begin{aligned}
Q_1\ {}_i\infty_0\ Q_2 = \Big(& s_p \circ F_\Delta^{(1)}(z_1,\theta_1),\ldots, s_p \circ F_\Delta^{(1)}(z_{i-1},\theta_{i-1}), s_p \circ F_\Delta^{(2)}(z'_1,\theta'_1),\ldots,\\
& s_p \circ F_\Delta^{(2)}(z'_{n-1},\theta'_{n-1}), -F_\Delta^{(1)}(0), s_p \circ F_\Delta^{(1)}(z_{i+1},\theta_{i+1}),\ldots,\\
& s_p \circ F_\Delta^{(1)}(z_{m-1},\theta_{m-1});\ \ \big((\tilde{E}^{-1})^0(H_0^{(1)} \circ (F_\Delta^{(1)})^{-1} \circ s_p^{-1} \circ I^{-1}(w,\rho)),\\
& i(\tilde{E}^{-1})^1(H_0^{(1)} \circ (F_\Delta^{(1)})^{-1} \circ s_p^{-1} \circ I^{-1}(w,\rho))\big),\\
& \hat{E}^{-1}(H_1^{(1)} \circ s_{(z_1,\theta_1)} \circ (F_\Delta^{(1)})^{-1} \circ s^{-1}_{F_\Delta^{(1)}(z_1,\theta_1)}(w,\rho)),\ldots,\\
& \hat{E}^{-1}(H_{i-1}^{(1)} \circ s_{(z_{i-1},\theta_{i-1})} \circ (F_\Delta^{(1)})^{-1} \circ s^{-1}_{F_\Delta^{(1)}(z_{i-1},\theta_{i-1})}(w,\rho)),\\
& \hat{E}^{-1}(H_1^{(2)} \circ s_{(z'_1,\theta'_1)} \circ (F_\Delta^{(2)})^{-1} \circ s^{-1}_{F_\Delta^{(2)}(z'_1,\theta'_1)}(w,\rho)),\ldots,\\
& \hat{E}^{-1}(H_{n-1}^{(2)} \circ s_{(z'_{n-1},\theta'_{n-1})} \circ (F_\Delta^{(2)})^{-1} \circ s^{-1}_{F_\Delta^{(2)}(z'_{n-1},\theta'_{n-1})}(w,\rho)),\\
& \hat{E}^{-1}(H_n^{(2)} \circ (F_\Delta^{(2)})^{-1}(w,\rho)),\\
& \hat{E}^{-1}(H_{i+1}^{(1)} \circ s_{(z_{i+1},\theta_{i+1})} \circ (F_\Delta^{(1)})^{-1} \circ s^{-1}_{F_\Delta^{(1)}(z_{i+1},\theta_{i+1})}(w,\rho)),\ldots,\\
& \hat{E}^{-1}(H_{m-1}^{(1)} \circ s_{(z_{m-1},\theta_{m-1})} \circ (F_\Delta^{(1)})^{-1} \circ s^{-1}_{F_\Delta^{(1)}(z_{m-1},\theta_{m-1})}(w,\rho)),\\
& \hat{E}^{-1}(H_m^{(1)} \circ (F_\Delta^{(1)})^{-1} \circ s_p^{-1}(w,\rho))\Big).
\end{aligned}$$

(5) When $i < m$ and $n = 0$, writing $F_\Delta^{(1)}(0) = p \in \bigwedge_\infty$, the punctures of the canonical supersphere represented by $Q_1\ {}_i\infty_0\ Q_2$ are

$$\begin{aligned}
\infty,\ & s_p \circ F_\Delta^{(1)}(z_1,\theta_1),\ldots, s_p \circ F_\Delta^{(1)}(z_{i-1},\theta_{i-1}),\ s_p \circ F_\Delta^{(1)}(z_{i+1},\theta_{i+1}),\ldots,\\
& s_p \circ F_\Delta^{(1)}(z_{m-1},\theta_{m-1}),\ 0;
\end{aligned}$$

and the local coordinates vanishing at these punctures are

$$\begin{aligned}
& H_0^{(1)} \circ (F_\Delta^{(1)})^{-1} \circ s_p^{-1}(w,\rho),\\
& H_1^{(1)} \circ s_{(z_1,\theta_1)} \circ (F_\Delta^{(1)})^{-1} \circ s_p^{-1}(w,\rho),\ldots, H_{i-1}^{(1)} \circ s_{(z_{i-1},\theta_{i-1})} \circ (F_\Delta^{(1)})^{-1} \circ s_p^{-1}(w,\rho),\\
& H_{i+1}^{(1)} \circ s_{(z_{i+1},\theta_{i+1})} \circ (F_\Delta^{(1)})^{-1} \circ s_p^{-1}(w,\rho),\ldots,\\
& H_{m-1}^{(1)} \circ s_{(z_{m-1},\theta_{m-1})} \circ (F_\Delta^{(1)})^{-1} \circ s_p^{-1}(w,\rho),\\
& H_m^{(1)} \circ (F_\Delta^{(1)})^{-1} \circ s_p^{-1}(w,\rho),
\end{aligned}$$

respectively. Thus

$$
\begin{aligned}
Q_1\ {}_i\infty_0\ Q_2 = \Big(& s_p \circ F_\Delta^{(1)}(z_1, \theta_1), ..., s_p \circ F_\Delta^{(1)}(z_{i-1}, \theta_{i-1}), s_p \circ F_\Delta^{(1)}(z_{i+1}, \theta_{i+1}), ..., \\
& s_p \circ F_\Delta^{(1)}(z_{m-1}, \theta_{m-1});\ \ \big((\tilde{E}^{-1})^0(H_0^{(1)} \circ (F_\Delta^{(1)})^{-1} \circ s_p^{-1} \circ I^{-1}(w, \rho)), \\
& i(\tilde{E}^{-1})^1(H_0^{(1)} \circ (F_\Delta^{(1)})^{-1} \circ s_p^{-1} \circ I^{-1}(w, \rho)\big), \\
& \hat{E}^{-1}(H_1^{(1)} \circ s_{(z_1, \theta_1)} \circ (F_\Delta^{(1)})^{-1} \circ s^{-1}_{F_\Delta^{(1)}(z_1, \theta_1)}(w, \rho)), ..., \\
& \hat{E}^{-1}(H_{i-1}^{(1)} \circ s_{(z_{i-1}, \theta_{i-1})} \circ (F_\Delta^{(1)})^{-1} \circ s^{-1}_{F_\Delta^{(1)}(z_{i-1}, \theta_{i-1})}(w, \rho)), \\
& \hat{E}^{-1}(H_{i+1}^{(1)} \circ s_{(z_{i+1}, \theta_{i+1})} \circ (F_\Delta^{(1)})^{-1} \circ s^{-1}_{F_\Delta^{(1)}(z_{i+1}, \theta_{i+1})}(w, \rho)), ..., \\
& \hat{E}^{-1}(H_{m-1}^{(1)} \circ s_{(z_{m-1}, \theta_{m-1})} \circ (F_\Delta^{(1)})^{-1} \circ s^{-1}_{F_\Delta^{(1)}(z_{m-1}, \theta_{m-1})}(w, \rho)), \\
& \hat{E}^{-1}(H_m^{(1)} \circ (F_\Delta^{(1)})^{-1} \circ s_p^{-1}(w, \rho))\Big).
\end{aligned}
$$

PROOF. If the i-th tube of Q_1 can be sewn with the 0-th tube of Q_2, then by definition there exist $r_1, r_2 \in \mathbb{R}_+$ satisfying $r_1 > r_2$ and DeWitt open neighborhoods $U_i^{(1)}$ and $U_0^{(2)}$ of $(z_i, \theta_i) \in Q_1$ and $(\infty, 0) \in Q_2$, respectively, such that: (z_i, θ_i) and $(\infty, 0)$ are the only punctures in $U_i^{(1)}$ and $U_0^{(2)}$, respectively; $H^{(1)} \circ s_{(z_i, \theta_i)}(w, \rho)$ and $H^{(2)}(w, \rho)$ are convergent in $U_i^{(1)}$ and $U_0^{(2)}$, respectively; and $\bar{\mathcal{B}}_0^{r_1} \subset H^{(1)} \circ s_{(z_i, \theta_i)}(U_i^{(1)})$ and $\bar{\mathcal{B}}_0^{1/r_2} \subset H^{(2)}(U_0^{(2)})$. The positive numbers r_1 and r_2 satisfy all the properties needed. Conversely, if there exist $r_1, r_2 \in \mathbb{R}_+$, with $r_1 > r_2$ such that $(H^{(1)})^{-1}(w, \rho)$ and $(H^{(2)})^{-1}(w, \rho)$ are convergent and single-valued in $\mathcal{B}_0^{r_1}$ and $\mathcal{B}_0^{1/r_2} \smallsetminus (\{0\} \times (\bigwedge_\infty)_S)$, respectively,

$$(-z_i, -\theta_i), (z_k - z_i - \theta_k\theta_i, \theta_k - \theta_i) \notin (H^{(1)})^{-1}(\mathcal{B}_0^{r_1}),$$

for $k = 1, ..., m-1$, $k \neq i$, and

$$0, (z'_l, \theta'_l) \notin (H^{(2)})^{-1}(\mathcal{B}_0^{1/r_2} \smallsetminus (\{0\} \times (\textstyle\bigwedge_\infty)_S)),$$

for $l = 1, ..., n-1$, then we can choose r to be any positive number between r_1 and r_2, and we can let

$$U_i^{(1)} = s^{-1}_{(z_i, \theta_i)} \circ (H^{(1)})^{-1}(\mathcal{B}_0^{r_1})$$

and

$$U_0^{(2)} = (H^{(2)})^{-1}(\mathcal{B}_0^{1/r_2}).$$

By assumption, (z_i, θ_i) and $(\infty, 0)$ are the only punctures in $U_i^{(1)}$ and $U_0^{(2)}$, respectively. In addition,

$$\bar{\mathcal{B}}_0^{r} \subset \mathcal{B}_0^{r_1} = H^{(1)} \circ s_{(z_i, \theta_i)}(U_i^{(1)})$$

and

$$\bar{\mathcal{B}}_0^{1/r} \subset \mathcal{B}_0^{1/r_2} = H^{(2)}(U_0^{(2)}).$$

Thus the i-th tube of Q_1 can be sewn with the 0-th tube of Q_2. This finishes the first statement of the proposition.

Now assume that the m-th tube of Q_1 can be sewn with the 0-th tube of Q_2 and $n > 0$. By the definition of the sewing operation, the canonical supersphere

$Q_1\ {}_m\infty_0\ Q_2$ is in the same superconformal equivalence class as the supersphere with tubes

$$\big(S; p_0, p_1, ..., p_{m+n-1}; (U_0, \Omega_0), ..., (U_{m+n-1}, \Omega_{m+n-1})\big) \tag{4.33}$$

where the supersphere S is given by the local coordinate system

$$\{(W^{(1)}, R^{(1)}), (W^{(2)}, R^{(2)})\}$$

with the coordinate transition function given by

$$R^{(2)} \circ (R^{(1)})^{-1}(w, \rho) = (H^{(2)})^{-1} \circ I \circ H^{(1)} \circ s_{(z_i,\theta_i)}(w, \rho)$$

for $(w, \rho) \in R^{(1)}(W^{(1)} \cap W^{(2)})$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} R^{(1)}(W^{(1)}) &= S\hat{\mathbb{C}} \smallsetminus s^{-1}_{(z_i,\theta_i)} \circ (H^{(1)})^{-1}(\bar{\mathcal{B}}_0^{r_2}) \\ R^{(2)}(W^{(2)}) &= \bigwedge\nolimits_\infty \smallsetminus (H^{(2)})^{-1}(\bar{\mathcal{B}}_0^{1/r_1}); \end{aligned}$$

$p_0, ..., p_{m-1} \in W^{(1)}$, with coordinates $\infty, (z_1, \theta_1), ..., (z_{m-1}, \theta_{m-1})$, respectively; $p_m, ..., p_{m+n-1} \in W^{(2)}$, with coordinates $(z'_1, \theta'_1), ..., (z'_{n-1}, \theta'_{n-1}), 0$, respectively; in terms of the coordinate $(w, \rho) = R^{(1)}(p)$ for $p \in W^{(1)}$,

$$\Omega_k(p) = H_k^{(1)} \circ s_{(z_k,\theta_k)}(w, \rho), \quad \text{for} \quad k = 0, ..., m-1;$$

and in terms of the coordinate $(w, \rho) = R^{(2)}(p)$ for $p \in W^{(2)}$,

$$\Omega_{m-1+l}(p) = H_l^{(2)} \circ s_{(z'_l,\theta'_l)}(w, \rho), \quad \text{for} \quad l = 1, ..., n-1.$$

By Proposition 2.15, there exists a superconformal equivalence F from this supersphere with tubes to some canonical supersphere with tubes

$$\begin{aligned} \big(S\hat{\mathbb{C}}; \Upsilon^{-1}(0), \Delta^{-1}(x_1, \varphi_1), ..., \Delta^{-1}(x_{m+n-2}, \varphi_{m+n-2}), \Delta^{-1}(0); \\ (\Delta^{-1}(\mathcal{B}_\infty^{r'_0}) \cup \Upsilon^{-1}(\{0\} \times (\bigwedge\nolimits_\infty)_S), H_0), (\Delta^{-1}(\mathcal{B}_{x_1}^{r'_1}), H_1 \circ \Delta), ..., \\ (\Delta^{-1}(\mathcal{B}_{x_{m+n-2}}^{r'_{m+n-2}}), H_{m+n-2} \circ \Delta), (\Delta^{-1}(\mathcal{B}_0^{r'_{m+n-1}}), H_{m+n-1} \circ \Delta)\big). \end{aligned} \tag{4.34}$$

Let

$$F_\Delta^{(1)}(w, \rho) = F \circ (R^{(1)})^{-1}(w, \rho)$$

for $(w, \rho) \in R^{(1)}(W^{(1)})$, and let

$$F_\Delta^{(2)}(w, \rho) = F \circ (R^{(2)})^{-1}(w, \rho)$$

for $(w, \rho) \in R^{(2)}(W^{(2)})$. Then in $W^{(1)} \cap W^{(2)}$, we have

$$F_\Delta^{(1)} \circ R^{(1)}(p) = F_\Delta^{(2)} \circ R^{(2)}(p). \tag{4.35}$$

It is clear that we can choose $F^{(1)}$ and $F^{(2)}$ to satisfy (4.28) – (4.30). On the other hand, for $p \in W^{(1)} \cap W^{(2)}$,

$$R^{(2)}(p) = (H^{(2)})^{-1} \circ I \circ H^{(1)} \circ s_{(z_i,\theta_i)} \circ R^{(1)}(p). \tag{4.36}$$

By (4.35) and (4.36), $F^{(1)}$ and $F^{(2)}$ satisfy (4.31). The formula in case (1) follows immediately from the relation between canonical superspheres and elements of $SK(m+n-1)$. This finishes the proof for case (1) $i = m$ and $n > 0$ up to uniqueness of $F^{(1)}$ and $F^{(2)}$. Cases (2) – (5) are proved similarly.

To prove that $F^{(1)}$ and $F^{(2)}$ are unique, assume that there exists another pair of functions $\tilde{F}^{(1)}$ and $\tilde{F}^{(2)}$ which also satisfy (4.28) – (4.31). If we define

$$\tilde{F}(p) = \left\{ \begin{array}{lll} \tilde{F}^{(1)}_{\Delta} \circ R^{(1)}(p) & \text{for} & p \in W^{(1)}, \\ \tilde{F}^{(2)}_{\Delta} \circ R^{(2)}(p) & \text{for} & p \in W^{(2)}, \end{array} \right.$$

then $\tilde{F}$ is a superconformal equivalence from the supersphere with tubes (4.33) to a canonical supersphere with tubes. Thus $\tilde{F} \circ F^{-1}$ is a superconformal equivalence from one canonical supersphere with tubes to another canonical supersphere with tubes. By Corollary 2.22, we see that $\tilde{F} \circ F^{-1}$ must be the identity map, or equivalently $\tilde{F} = F$. Therefore $\tilde{F}^{(1)} = F^{(1)}$ and $\tilde{F}^{(2)} = F^{(2)}$. This proves the uniqueness of $F^{(1)}$ and $F^{(2)}$. $\square$

Note that

$$s_{(z,\theta)}(w,\rho) = \exp\bigl(zL_{-1}(w,\rho) + \theta G_{-\frac{1}{2}}(w,\rho)\bigr) \cdot (w,\rho).$$

Thus using the formal solution to the sewing equation given in Chapter 3 to express the components of the uniformizing function formally as

$$\begin{aligned} F^{(1)}_{\Delta}(x,\varphi) &= \bar{F}^{(1)} \circ s_{(z_i,\theta_i)}(x,\varphi)\Big|_{(\alpha_0^{1/2},\mathcal{A},\mathcal{M},\mathcal{B},\mathcal{N})=(a_{\square}^{(i)},A^{(i)},M^{(i)},B^{(0)},N^{(0)})} \\ F^{(2)}_{\Delta}(x,\varphi) &= \bar{F}^{(2)}(x,\varphi)\Big|_{(\alpha_0^{1/2},\mathcal{A},\mathcal{M},\mathcal{B},\mathcal{N})=(a_{\square}^{(i)},A^{(i)},M^{(i)},B^{(0)},N^{(0)})}, \end{aligned}$$

we see that formally all the terms in the sewing formulas given in Proposition 4.16 can be expressed in terms of infinitesimal superconformal transformations. In order to use the formal solution as an actual analytic and geometric solution, we need to show that the power series expansions of $F^{(1)}_{\Delta}$ and $F^{(2)}_{\Delta}$ converge and are equal to $\bar{F}^{(1)} \circ s_{(z_i,\theta_i)}$ and $\bar{F}^{(2)}$, respectively, evaluated at $(\alpha_0^{1/2},\mathcal{A},\mathcal{M},\mathcal{B},\mathcal{N}) = (a_{\square}^{(i)},A^{(i)},M^{(i)},B^{(0)},N^{(0)})$. The absolute convergence of these series is equivalent to the absolute convergence of the x and φ coefficients of

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{F}^{(1)}_{Q_1,Q_2,t^{1/2}}(x,\varphi) \;=\; \exp\Biggl(\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}\biggl(&\Psi_{-j}(t^{-\frac{1}{2}}a_{\square}^{(i)},A^{(i)},M^{(i)},B^{(0)},N^{(0)})L_{-j}(x,\varphi) \\ &+ \Psi_{-j+\frac{1}{2}}(t^{-\frac{1}{2}}a_{\square}^{(i)},A^{(i)},M^{(i)},B^{(0)},N^{(0)})G_{-j+\frac{1}{2}}(x,\varphi)\biggr)\Biggr) \cdot (x,\varphi) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{F}^{(2)}_{Q_1,Q_2,t^{1/2}}(x,\varphi) = \exp\Bigl(&-\Psi_0(t^{-\frac{1}{2}}a_{\square}^{(i)},A^{(i)},M^{(i)},B^{(0)},N^{(0)})2L_0(x,\varphi)\Bigr) \cdot \\ &\cdot (a_{\square}^{(i)})^{2L_0(x,\varphi)} \cdot \exp\Biggl(-\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}\biggl(\Psi_j(t^{-\frac{1}{2}}a_{\square}^{(i)},A^{(i)},M^{(i)},B^{(0)},N^{(0)})L_j(x,\varphi) \\ &+ \Psi_{j-\frac{1}{2}}(t^{-\frac{1}{2}}a_{\square}^{(i)},A^{(i)},M^{(i)},B^{(0)},N^{(0)})G_{j-\frac{1}{2}}(x,\varphi)\biggr)\Biggr) \cdot (x,\varphi) \end{aligned}$$

as power series in the complex variable $t^{1/2}$ for $|t^{1/2}| \leq 1$.

Define

$$\begin{aligned} Q_1(t^{\frac{1}{2}}) = \big(&(z_1,\theta_1),\dots,(z_{m-1},\theta_{m-1});(A^{(0)},M^{(0)}),\dots,(a_\square^{(i-1)},A^{(i-1)},M^{(i-1)}),\\ &(t^{-\frac{1}{2}}a_\square^{(i)},A^{(i)},M^{(i)}),(a_\square^{(i+1)},A^{(i+1)},M^{(i+1)}),\dots,(a_\square^{(m)},A^{(m)},M^{(m)})\big), \end{aligned}$$

and apply Proposition 4.16 to Q_2 sewn into the i-th puncture of $Q_1(t^{1/2})$ for $0 < |t^{1/2}| \leq 1$. Denote the two functions $F^{(1)}$ and $F^{(2)}$ giving the canonical supersphere in this case by $F^{(1)}_{t^{1/2}}$ and $F^{(2)}_{t^{1/2}}$, respectively. If we can prove that the expansion coefficients of $\Delta \circ F^{(1)}_{t^{1/2}} \circ \Delta^{-1} = F^{(1)}_{t^{1/2},\Delta}$ and $\Delta \circ F^{(2)}_{t^{1/2}} \circ \Delta^{-1} = F^{(2)}_{t^{1/2},\Delta}$ as analytic functions in w and ρ are analytic in $t^{1/2}$ for $|t^{1/2}| \leq 1$, and their expansions as Laurent series in $t^{1/2}$ are equal to the corresponding x and φ coefficients of $\bar{F}^{(1)}_{Q_1,Q_2,t^{1/2}} \circ s_{(z_i,\theta_i)}(x,\varphi)$ and $\bar{F}^{(2)}_{Q_1,Q_2,t^{1/2}}(x,\varphi)$, respectively, then these x and φ coefficients of $\bar{F}^{(1)}_{Q_1,Q_2,t^{1/2}} \circ s_{(z_i,\theta_i)}(x,\varphi)$ and $\bar{F}^{(2)}_{Q_1,Q_2,t^{1/2}}(x,\varphi)$ are absolutely convergent for $|t^{1/2}| \leq 1$. In particular, taking $t^{1/2} = 1$, we would have that each x and φ coefficient of $\bar{F}^{(1)}_{Q_1,Q_2} \circ s_{(z_i,\theta_i)}(x,\varphi)$ and $\bar{F}^{(2)}_{Q_1,Q_2}(x,\varphi)$ is absolutely convergent to the corresponding w and ρ coefficients of $F^{(1)}_\Delta$ and $F^{(2)}_\Delta$.

REMARK 4.17. Since by Theorem 3.26, $\bar{F}^{(1)}_{Q_1,Q_2}(x,\varphi)$ and $\bar{F}^{(2)}_{Q_1,Q_2}(x,\varphi)$ depend algebraically on

$$\begin{aligned} &H^{(1)}_{a_\square^{1/2},A,M}(x,\varphi)\\ &\quad = \exp\Bigg(-\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}\Big(A_jL_j(x,\varphi) + M_{j-\frac{1}{2}}G_{j-\frac{1}{2}}(x,\varphi)\Big)\Bigg)\cdot (a_\square^{\frac{1}{2}})^{-2L_0(x,\varphi)}\cdot(x,\varphi) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$H^{(2)}_{B,N}(x,\varphi) = \exp\Bigg(\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}\Big(B_jL_{-j}(x,\varphi) + N_{j-\frac{1}{2}}G_{-j+\frac{1}{2}}(x,\varphi)\Big)\Bigg)\cdot\Big(\frac{1}{x},\frac{i\varphi}{x}\Big),$$

and are determined uniquely by the formal sewing equation and formal boundary conditions, the convergence described above and proved below implies that $F^{(1)}$ and $F^{(2)}$ depend algebraically on the local coordinate maps $H^{(1)}(w,\rho)$ and $H^{(2)}(w-z_i-\rho\theta_i,\rho-\theta_i)$ in the sense that the formal series obtained from the expansions of $F^{(1)}$ and $F^{(2)}$ depend algebraically on the formal series obtained from the expansions of $H^{(1)}(w,\rho)$ and $H^{(2)}(w-z_i-\rho\theta_i,\rho-\theta_i)$. In addition, we see that $F^{(1)}$ and $F^{(2)}$ are determined directly and explicitly by the sewing equation, normalization conditions, boundary conditions and the algebraic dependency on $H^{(1)}(w,\rho)$ and $H^{(2)}(w-z_i-\rho\theta_i,\rho-\theta_i)$. Thus a consequence of the convergence result below is the answers to the questions posed at the end of Section 2.6 regarding the dependency of the uniformizing function on the local coordinates.

We follow the argument in [**H2**] using a theorem proved by Fischer and Grauert [**FG**] in the deformation theory of complex manifolds to prove the analyticity in $t^{1/2}$. However, the supersphere $Q_1(t^{1/2})\ {}_i\infty_0\ Q_2$ is of course an infinite-dimensional non-compact complex manifold, and the Fischer-Grauert Theorem only applies to finite-dimensional compact manifolds, e.g., the body of this supersphere. But we do have that $Q_1(t^{1/2})\ {}_i\infty_0\ Q_2$ is a fiber bundle over the body, with fiber isomorphic to $(\bigwedge_\infty)_S$, and we can define two families of global sections for each $(w_S,\rho)\in(\bigwedge_\infty)_S$

such that each section is complex analytically isomorphic to the Riemann sphere. We can then apply the Fischer-Grauert Theorem to each section and analyze the behavior in $t^{1/2}$. This will allow us to prove certain analyticity properties of the uniformizing function $F_{t^{1/2}}$ for $0 < |t^{1/2}| \leq 1$, on each section. The sections that we will define completely cover the fiber bundle that the canonical supersphere represented by $Q_1(t^{1/2})\ {}_i\infty_0\ Q_2$ defines in such a way as to give the analyticity of the uniformizing function $F_{t^{1/2}}$ for $0 < |t^{1/2}| \leq 1$ on the entire supersphere. We will then analyze the nature of the singularity at $t^{1/2} = 0$ of the components of the uniformizing function $F^{(1)}_{t^{1/2},\Delta}(w,\rho)$ and $F^{(2)}_{t^{1/2},\Delta}(w,\rho)$ and expand each function as a Laurent series in w, ρ and $t^{1/2}$. We then show that the formal series corresponding to these expansions with (w,ρ) replaced by (x,φ) are the same as the formal series $\bar{F}^{(1)}_{Q_1,Q_2,t^{1/2}} \circ s_{(z_i,\theta_i)}(x,\varphi)$ and $\bar{F}^{(2)}_{Q_1,Q_2,t^{1/2}}(x,\varphi)$, respectively. This proves the analyticity and convergence of the series $\Psi_j(t^{-\frac{1}{2}}a, A, M, B, N)$, for $j \in \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{Z}$ and $|t^{\frac{1}{2}}| \leq 1$.

Now we present a brief description of the Fischer-Grauert Theorem following [**H2**]. Let $\mathcal{D}$ be a connected complex manifold, and let $\mathfrak{M} = \{M_t \mid t \in \mathcal{D}\}$ be a family of compact complex manifolds parameterized by $t \in \mathcal{D}$. We say that M_t *depends holomorphically* (or *complex analytically*) *on* t and that $\mathfrak{M} = \{M_t \mid t \in \mathcal{D}\}$ *forms a complex analytic family* if there is a complex manifold $\mathbf{M}$ and a holomorphic map $\bar{\omega}$ from $\mathbf{M}$ onto $\mathcal{D}$ such that

(i) $\bar{\omega}^{-1}(t) = M_t$ for each $t \in \mathcal{D}$, and

(ii) the rank of the Jacobian of $\bar{\omega}$ is equal to the complex dimension of $\mathcal{D}$ at each point of $\mathbf{M}$.

If each point $t \in \mathcal{D}$ has a neighborhood Δ_t such that $\bar{\omega}^{-1}(\Delta_t)$ is complex analytically isomorphic to $M_t \times \Delta_t$ and the diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\bar{\omega}^{-1}(\Delta_t) \arrow[r, "\sim"] \arrow[d, "\bar{\omega}"] & M_t \times \Delta_t \arrow[d, "\text{proj.}"] \\
\Delta_t \arrow[r] & \Delta_t
\end{tikzcd}$$

is commutative, then we say that $\mathfrak{M} = \{M_t \mid t \in \mathcal{D}\}$ is *locally trivial* (complex analytically).

THEOREM 4.18. *(Fischer-Grauert) If for all $t \in \mathcal{D}$, the M_t's are complex analytically isomorphic, then $\mathfrak{M}$ is locally trivial.*

The proof of this theorem can be found in [**FG**].

Next we construct two sets of global sections for the super-Riemann sphere $S\hat{\mathbb{C}}$ viewed as a fiber bundle over the Riemann sphere $\mathbb{C} \cup \infty = S\hat{\mathbb{C}}_B$. Recall that $S\hat{\mathbb{C}}$ is given by the superconformal coordinate atlas $\{(U_\Delta, \Delta), (U_\Upsilon, \Upsilon)\}$ with coordinate transition function $\Delta \circ \Upsilon^{-1} = I$, and the Riemann sphere can then be represented by the coordinate atlas $\{((U_\Delta)_B, \Delta_B), ((U_\Upsilon)_B, \Upsilon_B)\}$. For $(w_S, \rho) \in (\bigwedge_\infty)_S$ define the global section $\sigma_{(w_S,\rho)} : S\hat{\mathbb{C}}_B \to S\hat{\mathbb{C}}$ by

$$\sigma_{(w_S,\rho)}(p_B) = \begin{cases} \Delta^{-1}(\Delta_B(p_B) + w_S, \rho) & \text{for } p_B \in (U_\Delta)_B, \\ \Upsilon^{-1}(0) & \text{for } p_B \notin (U_\Delta)_B. \end{cases} \tag{4.37}$$

Similarly, for $(w_S, \rho) \in (\bigwedge_\infty)_S$ define the global section $\tau_{(w_S,\rho)} : S\hat{\mathbb{C}}_B \to S\hat{\mathbb{C}}$ by

$$\tau_{(w_S,\rho)}(p_B) = \begin{cases} \Upsilon^{-1}(\Upsilon_B(p_B) + w_S, \rho) & \text{for } p_B \in (U_\Upsilon)_B, \\ \Delta^{-1}(0) & \text{for } p_B \notin (U_\Upsilon)_B. \end{cases} \tag{4.38}$$

Then for $(w_S, \rho) \in (\bigwedge_\infty)_S$, the spaces $\sigma_{(w_S,\rho)}(S\hat{\mathbb{C}}_B)$ and $\tau_{(w_S,\rho)}(S\hat{\mathbb{C}}_B)$ each define Riemann spheres. Note that if M is any genus zero superconformal manifold with uniformizing function $F : M \longrightarrow S\hat{\mathbb{C}}$, for each $(w_S, \rho) \in (\bigwedge_\infty)_S$, we have the global sections of the fiber bundle M given by $F^{-1} \circ \sigma_{(w_S,\rho)} \circ F_B : M_B \longrightarrow M$ and $F^{-1} \circ \tau_{(w_S,\rho)} \circ F_B : M_B \longrightarrow M$.

For $Q_1 \in SK(m)$ and $Q_2 \in SK(n)$ as in Proposition 4.16, and

$$\begin{aligned} Q_1(t^{\frac{1}{2}}) = \big((z_1, \theta_1), ..., (z_{m-1}, \theta_{m-1}); (A^{(0)}, M^{(0)}), ..., (a_\square^{(i-1)}, A^{(i-1)}, M^{(i-1)}),\\ (t^{-\frac{1}{2}} a_\square^{(i)}, A^{(i)}, M^{(i)}), (a_\square^{(i+1)}, A^{(i+1)}, M^{(i+1)}), ..., (a^{(m)}, A^{(m)}, M^{(m)})\big), \end{aligned}$$

define

$$H_{t^{1/2}}^{(1)}(x, \varphi) = \hat{E}(t^{-\frac{1}{2}} a_\square^{(i)}, A^{(i)}, M^{(i)})(x, \varphi).$$

Since the i-th tube of Q_1 can be sewn with the 0-th tube of Q_2, it is easy to see from Proposition 4.16 that the i-th tube of $Q_1(t^{1/2})$ can be also be sewn with the 0-th tube of Q_2 when $0 < |t^{1/2}| < r$ for some $r > 1$. By Proposition 4.16, for any such $t^{1/2}$ there exist $r_1(t^{1/2})$, $r_2(t^{1/2}) \in \mathbb{R}_+$ satisfying $r_1(t^{1/2}) > r_2(t^{1/2})$ and bijective superconformal functions $F_{t^{1/2}}^{(1)}$ and $F_{t^{1/2}}^{(2)}$ on $S\hat{\mathbb{C}} \smallsetminus \Delta^{-1} \circ s_{(z_i,\theta_i)}^{-1} \circ (H_{t^{1/2}}^{(1)})^{-1}(\bar{\mathcal{B}}_0^{r_2(t^{1/2})})$, and $U_\Delta \smallsetminus \Delta^{-1} \circ (H_{t^{1/2}}^{(2)})^{-1}(\bar{\mathcal{B}}_0^{1/r_1(t^{1/2})} \smallsetminus (\{0\} \times (\bigwedge_\infty)_S))$, respectively, such that the conclusion of Proposition 4.16 holds if we replace Q_1, $H^{(1)}$, r_1, r_2, $F^{(1)}$, and $F^{(2)}$ by $Q_1(t^{1/2})$, $H_{t^{1/2}}^{(1)}$, $r_1(t^{1/2})$, $r_2(t^{1/2})$, $F_{t^{1/2}}^{(1)}$, and $F_{t^{1/2}}^{(2)}$, respectively. Denote $r_1(1)$ and $r_2(1)$ by r_1 and r_2, respectively. From the definition of $H_{t^{1/2}}^{(1)}$, it is clear that we can choose $r_1(t^{1/2}) = r_1$ and $r_2(t^{1/2}) = r_2$ for all $t^{1/2}$.

PROPOSITION 4.19. *There exist $r \in \mathbb{R}$, $r > 1$ such that the superconformal superfunctions $F_{t^{1/2}}^{(1)}$ and $F_{t^{1/2}}^{(2)}$ are analytic in $t^{1/2}$ for $0 < |t^{1/2}| < r$. Furthermore, the singularity at $t^{1/2} = 0$ is a removable singularity of $F_{t^{1/2},\Delta}^{(1)}(w, \rho)$ and $F_{t^{1/2},\Delta}^{(2)}(w, \rho)$, and writing*

$$F_{t^{1/2},\Delta}^{(2)}(w, \rho) = \Big((F_{t^{1/2},\Delta}^{(2)}(w, \rho))^0, (F_{t^{1/2},\Delta}^{(2)}(w, \rho))^1\Big) \in {\textstyle\bigwedge}_\infty^0 \oplus {\textstyle\bigwedge}_\infty^1$$

we have that $t^{1/2} = 0$ is a second-order zero of $(F_{t^{1/2},\Delta}^{(2)}(w, \rho))^0$ and a first-order zero of $(F_{t^{1/2},\Delta}^{(2)}(w, \rho))^1$.

PROOF. $Q_1(t^{1/2})\ {}_i\infty_0\ Q_2$ is represented by a supersphere with tubes $M_{t^{1/2}}$ given by the local coordinate system

$$\{(W_{t^{1/2}}^{(1)}, R_{t^{1/2}}^{(1)}), (W_{t^{1/2}}^{(2)}, R_{t^{1/2}}^{(2)})\}$$

with the coordinate transition function given by

$$R_{t^{1/2}}^{(2)} \circ (R_{t^{1/2}}^{(1)})^{-1}(w, \rho) = (H^{(2)})^{-1} \circ I \circ H_{t^{1/2}}^{(1)} \circ s_{(z_i,\theta_i)}(w, \rho) \tag{4.39}$$

for $(w, \rho) \in R_{t^{1/2}}^{(1)}(W_{t^{1/2}}^{(1)} \cap W_{t^{1/2}}^{(2)})$ such that

$$R_{t^{1/2}}^{(1)}(W_{t^{1/2}}^{(1)}) = S\hat{\mathbb{C}} \smallsetminus \Delta^{-1} \circ s_{(z_i,\theta_i)}^{-1} \circ (H_{t^{1/2}}^{(1)})^{-1}(\bar{\mathcal{B}}_0^{r_2})$$

and

$$R_{t^{1/2}}^{(2)}(W_{t^{1/2}}^{(2)}) = U_\Delta \smallsetminus \Delta^{-1} \circ (H^{(2)})^{-1}(\bar{\mathcal{B}}_0^{1/r_1} \smallsetminus (\{0\} \times (\textstyle\bigwedge_\infty)_S)) = R^{(2)}(W^{(2)}).$$

We know that for each $t^{1/2}$ the coordinate transition function $(H^{(2)})^{-1} \circ I \circ H^{(1)}_{t^{1/2}} \circ s_{(z_i,\theta_i)}(w,\rho)$ is superconformal.

From the uniformizing function at $t^{1/2} = 1$, i.e., for $F = F_1 : M_1 \longrightarrow S\hat{\mathbb{C}}$, we have the global sections of M_1 given by $F_1^{-1} \circ \sigma_{(w_S,\rho)} \circ (F_1)_B$ and $F_1^{-1} \circ \tau_{(w_S,\rho)} \circ (F_1)_B$, for each $(w_S,\rho) \in (\bigwedge_\infty)_S$. Letting $t^{1/2}$ vary, we obtain global sections we denote by

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_{(w_S,\rho),t^{1/2}} : (M_{t^{1/2}})_B &\rightarrow M_{t^{1/2}} \\ \tau_{(w_S,\rho),t^{1/2}} : (M_{t^{1/2}})_B &\rightarrow M_{t^{1/2}}, \end{aligned}$$

respectively. Then defining

$$\begin{aligned} M^{\sigma(w_S,\rho)}_{t^{1/2}} &= \sigma_{(w_S,\rho),t^{1/2}}((M_{t^{1/2}})_B) \\ M^{\tau(w_S,\rho)}_{t^{1/2}} &= \tau_{(w_S,\rho),t^{1/2}}((M_{t^{1/2}})_B), \end{aligned}$$

we have that $M^{\sigma(w_S,\rho)}_{t^{1/2}}$ and $M^{\tau(w_S,\rho)}_{t^{1/2}}$ are genus zero compact complex manifolds.

Let

$$W^{(k)}_{t^{1/2},\sigma(w_S,\rho)} = (R^{(k)}_{t^{1/2}})^{-1} \circ \sigma_{(w_S,\rho),t^{1/2}}(W^{(k)}_{t^{1/2},B})$$

for $k = 1,2$, and let $R^{(k)}_{t^{1/2},\sigma(w_S,\rho)} : W^{(k)}_{t^{1/2},\sigma(w_S,\rho)} \rightarrow \bigwedge_\infty$ be the restriction of $R^{(k)}_{t^{1/2}}$ to $W^{(k)}_{t^{1/2},\sigma(w_S,\rho)}$, for $k = 1,2$. Then

$$\left\{ \left(W^{(1)}_{t^{1/2},\sigma(w_S,\rho)}, R^{(1)}_{t^{1/2},\sigma(w_S,\rho)} \right), \left(W^{(2)}_{t^{1/2},\sigma(w_S,\rho)}, R^{(2)}_{t^{1/2},\sigma(w_S,\rho)} \right) \right\}$$

is a coordinate system for $M^{\sigma(w_S,\rho)}_{t^{1/2}}$, with coordinate transition function given by

$$R^{(2)}_{t^{1/2},\sigma(w_S,\rho)} \circ (R^{(1)}_{t^{1/2},\sigma(w_S,\rho)})^{-1}(w,\rho) = (H^{(2)})^{-1} \circ I \circ H^{(1)}_{t^{1/2}} \circ s_{(z_i,\theta_i)}(w,\rho)$$

for $(w,\rho) \in R^{(1)}_{t^{1/2},\sigma(w_S,\rho)}(W^{(1)}_{t^{1/2},\sigma(w_S,\rho)} \cap W^{(2)}_{t^{1/2},\sigma(w_S,\rho)})$. It is clear that $M^{\sigma(w_S,\rho)}_{t^{1/2}}$ is complex analytically isomorphic to $(M_{t^{1/2}})_B$.

Let $\mathcal{D}_r = \{t^{1/2} \in \mathbb{C} \mid 0 < |t^{1/2}| < r, \ -\pi/2 < \arg t^{1/2} \leq \pi/2\}$ for $r \in \mathbb{R}_+$ and let $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}_r = \{t^{1/2} \in \mathbb{C} \mid 0 < |t^{1/2}| < r, \ \pi/2 < \arg t^{1/2} \leq 3\pi/2\}$. Consider $\mathfrak{M}^{\sigma(w_S,\rho)} = \{M^{\sigma(w_S,\rho)}_{t^{1/2}} \mid t^{1/2} \in \mathcal{D}_r\}$ and $\tilde{\mathfrak{M}}^{\sigma(w_S,\rho)} = \{M^{\sigma(w_S,\rho)}_{t^{1/2}} \mid t^{1/2} \in \tilde{\mathcal{D}}_r\}$. In [**H2**], Huang uses the Fischer-Grauert Theorem on the body component $\mathfrak{M}^{\sigma(0)}$ to prove that it is locally trivial in t, for $0 < |t| < r$. We will follow this argument in the more general case of $\mathfrak{M}^{\sigma(w_S,\rho)}$ and $\tilde{\mathfrak{M}}^{\sigma(w_S,\rho)}$ to prove that they are both locally trivial in $t^{1/2}$ for all $(w_S,\rho) \in (\bigwedge_\infty)_S$. The reason we split the domain of $t^{1/2}$ into $\mathcal{D}_r$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}_r$ is that we will need certain bijective properties to form a manifold from the family $\mathfrak{M}^{\sigma(w_S,\rho)}$, and thus have to restrict the domain of $t^{1/2}$ in order to insure that there is no double cover in the $t^{1/2}$ coordinate. We will then use the local triviality properties of $\mathfrak{M}^{\sigma(w_S,\rho)}$ and $\tilde{\mathfrak{M}}^{\sigma(w_S,\rho)}$ to show that $F^{(1)}_{t^{1/2}}$ and $F^{(2)}_{t^{1/2}}$ restricted to the sections $M^{\sigma(w_S,\rho)}_{t^{1/2}}$ are analytic in $t^{1/2}$ for $0 < |t^{1/2}| < r$. Using the family of sections $\tau_{(w_S,\rho)}$ instead of $\sigma_{(w_S,\rho)}$, the analogous argument for $\mathfrak{M}^{\tau(w_S,\rho)}$ and $\tilde{\mathfrak{M}}^{\tau(w_S,\rho)}$ shows that they are also locally trivial in $t^{1/2}$. Then the analogous argument can be used to prove that $F^{(1)}_{t^{1/2}}$ and $F^{(2)}_{t^{1/2}}$ restricted to the sections $M^{\tau(w_S,\rho)}_{t^{1/2}}$ are analytic in $t^{1/2}$ for $0 < |t^{1/2}| < r$. This will allow us to conclude that $F^{(1)}_{t^{1/2}}$ and $F^{(2)}_{t^{1/2}}$ themselves are analytic in $t^{1/2}$ for $0 < |t^{1/2}| < r$.

Let $\mathbf{M}^{\sigma(w_S,\rho)} = \bigcup_{t^{1/2}\in\mathcal{D}_r} M^{\sigma(w_S,\rho)}_{t^{1/2}}$. Let

$$\begin{aligned} U^{(1)}_{\sigma(w_S,\rho)} &= \bigcup_{t^{\frac{1}{2}}\in\mathcal{D}_r} W^{(1)}_{t^{1/2},\sigma(w_S,\rho)},\\ U^{(2)}_{\sigma(w_S,\rho)} &= \bigcup_{t^{\frac{1}{2}}\in\mathcal{D}_r} W^{(2)}_{t^{1/2},\sigma(w_S,\rho)}. \end{aligned}$$

Then $\mathbf{M}^{\sigma(w_S,\rho)} = U^{(1)}_{\sigma(w_S,\rho)} \cup U^{(2)}_{\sigma(w_S,\rho)}$. Let

$$V^{(1)}_{\sigma(w_S,\rho)} = \big\{(w_B, t^{\frac{1}{2}}) \in \mathbb{C}^2 \mid t^{\frac{1}{2}} \in \mathcal{D}_r,\ w_B \in \pi_B \circ R^{(1)}_{t^{1/2},\sigma(w_S,\rho)}(W^{(1)}_{t^{1/2},\sigma(w_S,\rho)})\big\},$$

and

$$V^{(2)}_{\sigma(w_S,\rho)} = \big\{(w_B, t^{\frac{1}{2}}) \in \mathbb{C}^2 \mid t^{\frac{1}{2}} \in \mathcal{D}_r,\ w_B \in \pi_B \circ R^{(2)}_{t^{1/2},\sigma(w_S,\rho)}(W^{(2)}_{t^{1/2},\sigma(w_S,\rho)})\big\}.$$

Obviously $V^{(k)}_{\sigma(w_S,\rho)}$ is an open set in $\mathbb{C}^2$ for $k = 1, 2$. We define

$$\begin{aligned} \beta^{(k)}_{\sigma(w_S,\rho)} : U^{(k)}_{\sigma(w_S,\rho)} &\longrightarrow V^{(k)}_{\sigma(w_S,\rho)}\\ p &\mapsto (\pi_B \circ R^{(k)}_{t^{1/2},\sigma(w_S,\rho)}(p), t^{\frac{1}{2}}) \end{aligned}$$

for $p \in W^{(k)}_{t^{1/2},\sigma(w_S,\rho)}$. It is clear that the $\beta^{(k)}_{\sigma(w_S,\rho)}$ are bijections. Thus

$$\big\{(U^{(k)}_{\sigma(w_S,\rho)}, \beta^{(k)}_{\sigma(w_S,\rho)})\big\}_{k=1,2}$$

is a local coordinate system for $\mathbf{M}^{\sigma(w_S,\rho)}$ with the coordinate transition function given by

$$\beta^{(2)}_{\sigma(w_S,\rho)} \circ (\beta^{(1)}_{\sigma(w_S,\rho)})^{-1}(w_B, t^{\frac{1}{2}}) = \Big(R^{(2)}_{t^{1/2},\sigma(w_S,\rho)} \circ (R^{(1)}_{t^{1/2},\sigma(w_S,\rho)})^{-1}(w_B), t^{\frac{1}{2}}\Big)$$

for $w_B \in \beta^{(2)}_{\sigma(w_S,\rho)}(U^{(1)}_{\sigma(w_S,\rho)} \cap U^{(2)}_{\sigma(w_S,\rho)})$.

This gives a complex manifold structure to $\mathbf{M}^{\sigma(w_S,\rho)}$. It is clear that the projection from $\mathbf{M}^{\sigma(w_S,\rho)}$ to $\mathcal{D}_r$ is complex analytic and the rank of the Jacobian is one. Thus $\mathfrak{M}^{\sigma(w_S,\rho)} = \{M^{\sigma(w_S,\rho)}_{t^{1/2}} \mid t^{1/2} \in \mathcal{D}_r\}$ is a complex analytic family. Since all the $M^{\sigma(w_S,\rho)}_{t^{1/2}}$ are complex analytically isomorphic to $S\hat{\mathbb{C}}_B = \mathbb{C} \cup \{\infty\}$, they are all complex analytically isomorphic to each other. By the Fischer-Grauert Theorem, $\mathfrak{M}^{\sigma(w_S,\rho)}$ is locally trivial for each $(w_S, \rho) \in (\Lambda_\infty)_S$. Thus given a section $\sigma_{t^{1/2}}(w_S, \rho)$, for every $t_0^{1/2} \in \mathcal{D}_r$, there exists a neighborhood of $t_0^{1/2}$, denoted $\Delta^{\sigma(w_S,\rho)}_{t_0^{1/2}} \subset \mathcal{D}_r$, such that complex analytically

$$\bigcup_{t^{1/2}\in\Delta^{\sigma(w_S,\rho)}_{t_0^{1/2}}} M^{\sigma(w_S,\rho)}_{t^{1/2}} \cong M^{\sigma(w_S,\rho)}_{t_0^{1/2}} \times \Delta^{\sigma(w_S,\rho)}_{t_0^{1/2}}.$$

Thus there exist complex analytic isomorphisms

$$\gamma^{\sigma(w_S,\rho)}_{t^{1/2}} : M^{\sigma(w_S,\rho)}_{t^{1/2}} \longrightarrow M^{\sigma(w_S,\rho)}_{t_0^{1/2}}$$

for any $t^{1/2} \in \Delta^{\sigma(w_S,\rho)}_{t_0^{1/2}}$ such that if we use the local coordinates of $M^{\sigma(w_S,\rho)}_{t^{1/2}}$ and $M^{\sigma(w_S,\rho)}_{t_0^{1/2}}$ to express $\gamma^{\sigma(w_S,\rho)}_{t^{1/2}}$, then $\gamma^{\sigma(w_S,\rho)}_{t^{1/2}}$ is also analytic in $t^{1/2}$.

For every $M_{t^{1/2}}^{\sigma(w_S,\rho)}$, we already have a superconformal isomorphism $F_{t^{1/2}}^{\sigma(w_S,\rho)}$ from $M_{t^{1/2}}^{\sigma(w_S,\rho)}$ to $\sigma_{(w_S,\rho)}(S\hat{\mathbb{C}}_B)$ given by

$$F_{t^{1/2}}^{\sigma(w_S,\rho)}(p) = \begin{cases} F_{t^{1/2}}^{(1)}(p) & \text{for } p \in W_{t^{1/2},\sigma(w_S,\rho)}^{(1)}, \\ \\ F_{t^{1/2}}^{(2)}(p) & \text{for } p \in W_{t^{1/2},\sigma(w_S,\rho)}^{(2)}. \end{cases}$$

For $a \in (\bigwedge_\infty^0)^\times$, define the superprojective transformation $T_a : S\hat{\mathbb{C}} \longrightarrow S\hat{\mathbb{C}}$ by (2.23) and

$$\begin{array}{rcl} (T_a)_\Delta : \bigwedge_\infty & \longrightarrow & \bigwedge_\infty \\ (w,\rho) & \mapsto & (a^2 w, a\rho). \end{array}$$

Choose a point $(w_0)_B \in \mathbb{C}^\times$. We can always find some function $\alpha^{\sigma(w_S,\rho)}(t^{1/2}) \neq 0$ from $\Delta_{t_0^{1/2}}^{\sigma(w_S,\rho)}$ to $\mathbb{C}^\times$ such that in terms of the coordinate atlas $\{(U_\Delta,\Delta),(U_\Upsilon,\Upsilon)\}$ of $S\hat{\mathbb{C}}$ restricted to the section $\sigma(w_S,\rho)(S\hat{\mathbb{C}}_B)$, the function

$$\Delta \circ T_{\alpha^{\sigma(w_S,\rho)}(t_0^{1/2})} \circ F_{t_0^{1/2}}^{\sigma(w_S,\rho)} \circ \gamma_{t^{1/2}}^{\sigma(w_S,\rho)} \\ \circ (F_{t^{1/2}}^{\sigma(w_S,\rho)})^{-1} \circ T^{-1}_{\alpha^{\sigma(w_S,\rho)}(t^{1/2})} \circ \Delta^{-1}((w_0)_B + w_S, \rho)$$

is analytic in $t^{1/2}$ for $t^{1/2} \in \Delta_{t_0^{1/2}}^{\sigma(w_S,\rho)}$. Note that

$$(T_{\alpha^{\sigma(w_S,\rho)}(t_0^{1/2})} \circ F_{t_0^{1/2}}^{\sigma(w_S,\rho)}) \circ \gamma_{t^{1/2}}^{\sigma(w_S,\rho)} \circ (T_{\alpha^{\sigma(w_S,\rho)}(t^{1/2})} \circ F_{t^{1/2}}^{\sigma(w_S,\rho)})^{-1}$$

is a family of analytic isomorphisms from $\sigma(w_S,\rho)(S\hat{\mathbb{C}}_B) \equiv S\hat{\mathbb{C}}_B$ to itself. Hence it must be a family of linear fractional transformations depending on $t^{1/2}$. Any linear fractional transformation is determined by its values on three complex variables. Furthermore, it is clear that if the values at these three points depend analytically on $t^{1/2}$, then the value at any point depends analytically on $t^{1/2}$. Consider the three points $\Delta^{-1}(0 + w_S, \rho)$, $\Upsilon^{-1}(0)$ and $\Delta^{-1}(w_0 + w_S, \rho) \in S\hat{\mathbb{C}}$. Since

$$T_{\alpha^{\sigma(w_S,\rho)}(t_0^{1/2})} \circ F_{t_0^{1/2}}^{\sigma(w_S,\rho)} \circ \gamma_{t^{1/2}}^{\sigma(w_S,\rho)} \circ (T_{\alpha^{\sigma(w_S,\rho)}(t^{1/2})} \circ F_{t^{1/2}}^{\sigma(w_S,\rho)})^{-1} \circ \Delta^{-1}(0) \\ = T_{\alpha^{\sigma(w_S,\rho)}(t_0^{1/2})} \circ F_{t_0^{1/2}}^{\sigma(w_S,\rho)} \circ \gamma_{t^{1/2}}^{\sigma(w_S,\rho)} \circ (R_{t^{1/2},\sigma(w_S,\rho)}^{(2)})^{-1}(0),$$

is analytic in $t^{1/2}$, and the value of any superfunction at $(w_B + w_s, \rho)$ is the Taylor expansion about the body w_B, we have that

$$T_{\alpha^{\sigma(w_S,\rho)}(t_0^{1/2})} \circ F_{t_0^{1/2}}^{\sigma(w_S,\rho)} \circ \gamma_{t^{1/2}}^{\sigma(w_S,\rho)} \circ (T_{\alpha^{\sigma(w_S,\rho)}(t^{1/2})} \circ F_{t^{1/2}}^{\sigma(w_S,\rho)})^{-1} \circ \Delta^{-1}(0 + w_S, \rho)$$

is analytic in $t^{1/2}$. Furthermore,

$$T_{\alpha^{\sigma(w_S,\rho)}(t_0^{1/2})} \circ F_{t_0^{1/2}}^{\sigma(w_S,\rho)} \circ \gamma_{t^{1/2}}^{\sigma(w_S,\rho)} \circ (T_{\alpha^{\sigma(w_S,\rho)}(t^{1/2})} \circ F_{t^{1/2}}^{\sigma(w_S,\rho)})^{-1} \circ \Upsilon^{-1}(0) \\ = T_{\alpha^{\sigma(w_S,\rho)}(t_0^{1/2})} \circ F_{t_0^{1/2}}^{\sigma(w_S,\rho)} \circ \gamma_{t^{1/2}}^{\sigma(w_S,\rho)} \circ (R_{t^{1/2},\sigma(w_S,\rho)}^{(1)})^{-1}(0),$$

is analytic in $t^{1/2}$, and by our choice of $\alpha^{\sigma(w_S,\rho)}$,

$$T_{\alpha^{\sigma(w_S,\rho)}(t_0^{1/2})} \circ F^{\sigma(w_S,\rho)}_{t_0^{1/2}} \circ \gamma^{\sigma(w_S,\rho)}_{t^{1/2}} \circ (T_{\alpha^{\sigma(w_S,\rho)}(t^{1/2})} \circ F^{\sigma(w_S,\rho)}_{t^{1/2}})^{-1} \\ \circ \Delta^{-1}((w_0)_B + w_S, \rho)$$

is analytic in $t^{1/2}$. Thus

$$(T_{\alpha^{\sigma(w_S,\rho)}(t_0^{1/2})} \circ F^{\sigma(w_S,\rho)}_{t_0^{1/2}}) \circ \gamma^{\sigma(w_S,\rho)}_{t^{1/2}} \circ (T_{\alpha^{\sigma(w_S,\rho)}(t^{1/2})} \circ F^{\sigma(w_S,\rho)}_{t^{1/2}})^{-1}$$

is analytic in $t^{1/2}$. This implies that $T_{\alpha^{\sigma(w_S,\rho)}(t^{1/2})} \circ F^{\sigma(w_S,\rho)}_{t^{1/2}}$ is analytic in $t^{1/2}$. By the definition of $F^{\sigma(w_S,\rho)}_{t^{1/2}}$ and the normalization conditions that it satisfies, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\rho(\Delta \circ T_{\alpha^{\sigma(w_S,\rho)}(t^{1/2})} \circ (F^{\sigma(w_S,\rho)}_{t^{1/2}})^{(1)} \circ (R^{(1)}_{t^{1/2},\sigma(w_S,\rho)})^{-1}(w,\rho))^0 \\ = \rho(\alpha^{\sigma(w_S,\rho)}(t^{\frac{1}{2}})w + \text{ terms of lower order in } w).\end{aligned}$$

Since $T_{\alpha^{\sigma(w_S,\rho)}(t^{1/2})} \circ F^{\sigma(w_S,\rho)}_{t^{1/2}}$ is analytic in $t^{1/2}$, its coefficients in w and ρ are also analytic in $t^{1/2}$. Hence $\alpha^{\sigma(w_S,\rho)}(t^{1/2})$ is analytic in $t^{1/2}$. We conclude that $F^{\sigma(w_S,\rho)}_{t^{1/2}}$ is analytic in $t^{1/2}$. Since $t_0^{1/2}$ is an arbitrary complex number in $\mathcal{D}_r$, we have that $F^{\sigma(w_S,\rho)}_{t^{1/2}}$ is analytic in $t^{1/2}$ for any $t^{1/2} \in \mathcal{D}_r$.

Following the same argument above with $\mathcal{D}_r$ replaced by $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}_r$, we conclude that $F^{\sigma(w_S,\rho)}_{t^{1/2}}$ is analytic in $t^{1/2}$ for $0 < |t^{1/2}| < r$. Then following a similar argument using the sections $\tau(w_S,\rho)$, we can prove that $F_{t^{1/2}}$ restricted to $M^{\tau(w_S,\rho)}_{t^{1/2}}$ is analytic in $t^{1/2}$ for $0 < |t^{1/2}| < r$. Then since

$$M_{t^{1/2}} = \bigcup_{(w_S,\rho)\in(\bigwedge_\infty)_S} (M^{\sigma(w_S,\rho)}_{t^{1/2}} \cup M^{\tau(w_S,\rho)}_{t^{1/2}}),$$

we have that $F_{t^{1/2}}$ is analytic in $t^{1/2}$ for every point $p \in M_{t^{1/2}}$. We conclude that $F_{t^{1/2}}$ is analytic in $t^{1/2}$ for $0 < |t^{1/2}| < r$, and thus $F^{(1)}_{t^{1/2}}$ and $F^{(2)}_{t^{1/2}}$ are analytic in $t^{1/2}$ for $0 < |t^{1/2}| < r$.

We now prove the second statement of the proposition. Let $(H^{(2)})^0(w,\rho)$ and $(H^{(2)})^1(w,\rho)$ be the even and odd superfunction components of $H^{(2)}(w,\rho)$, and let

$$H^{(2)}_{t^{1/2}}(w,\rho) = \Big(t^{-1}(H^{(2)})^0(t^{-1}w, t^{-\frac{1}{2}}\rho), t^{-\frac{1}{2}}(H^{(2)})^1(t^{-1}w, t^{-\frac{1}{2}}\rho)\Big)$$

for $t^{1/2} \neq 0$. For $t^{1/2} = 0$, we define

$$H^{(2)}_0(w,\rho) = \Big(\frac{1}{w}, \frac{i\rho}{w}\Big).$$

Then $H^{(2)}_{t^{1/2}}(w,\rho)$ is analytic in $t^{1/2}$ for $|t^{1/2}| \leq 1$.

Let [3]

$$\begin{aligned}Q_2(t^{\frac{1}{2}}) = \big((z'_1,\theta'_1), ..., (z'_{n-1},\theta'_{n-1}); \big((\tilde{E}^{-1})^0(H^{(2)}_{t^{1/2}} \circ I^{-1}(w,\rho)), \\ i(\tilde{E}^{-1})^1(H^{(2)}_{t^{1/2}} \circ I^{-1}(w,\rho))\big), (b^{(1)}, B^{(1)}, N^{(1)}), ..., (b^{(n)}, B^{(n)}, N^{(n)})\big)\end{aligned}$$

---

[3] There is a misprint in the analogous nonsuper case to the definition of $Q_2(t)$ given in [**H2**]. On p.85, in [**H2**], the coordinate at ∞ of the sphere $Q_2(t)$ should be $\tilde{E}^{-1}(f^{(2)}_t(1/x))$, not $\tilde{E}(f^{(2)}_t(1/x))$ as stated.

It is easy to see that the i-th tube of Q_1 can be sewn with the 0-th tube of $Q_2(t^{1/2})$ when $|t^{1/2}| \leq 1$. By Proposition 4.16, there exist $\tilde{F}^{(1)}_{t^{1/2}}$ and $\tilde{F}^{(2)}_{t^{1/2}}$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{F}^{(1)}_{t^{1/2},\Upsilon}(0) &= (0), \\ \lim_{w\to\infty} \frac{\partial}{\partial\rho}(\tilde{F}^{(1)}_{t^{1/2},\Delta})^1(w,\rho) &= 1, \\ \tilde{F}^{(2)}_{t^{1/2},\Delta}(0) &= (0), \end{aligned}$$

and in some region

$$\tilde{F}^{(1)}_{t^{1/2},\Delta}(w,\rho) = \tilde{F}^{(2)}_{t^{1/2},\Delta} \circ (H^{(2)}_{t^{1/2}})^{-1} \circ I \circ H^{(1)} \circ s_{(z_i,\theta_i)}(w,\rho)$$

holds for $|t^{1/2}| \leq 1$. Moreover $\tilde{F}^{(1)}_{t^{1/2}}$ and $\tilde{F}^{(2)}_{t^{1/2}}$ are unique. Using the same method as that used in the proof of the analyticity of $F^{(1)}_{t^{1/2}}$ and $F^{(2)}_{t^{1/2}}$, we can show that $\tilde{F}^{(1)}_{t^{1/2}}$ and $\tilde{F}^{(2)}_{t^{1/2}}$ are analytic in $t^{1/2}$ for $|t^{1/2}| \leq 1$. But from

$$F^{(1)}_{t^{1/2},\Delta}(w,\rho) = F^{(2)}_{t^{1/2},\Delta} \circ (H^{(2)})^{-1} \circ I \circ H^{(1)}_{t^{1/2}} \circ s_{(z_i,\theta_i)}(w,\rho)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} &H^{(1)}_{t^{1/2}} \circ s_{(z_i,\theta_i)}(w,\rho) \\ &\quad = \left(t^{-1}(H^{(1)})^0(w - z_i - \rho\theta_i, \rho - \theta_i), t^{-\frac{1}{2}}(H^{(1)})^1(w - z_i - \rho\theta_i, \rho - \theta_i)\right), \end{aligned}$$

we see that $F^{(1)}_{t^{1/2},\Delta}(w,\rho)$ and $F^{(2)}_{t^{1/2},\Delta}(t^{-1}w, t^{-1/2}\rho)$ satisfy the above equation for $\tilde{F}^{(1)}_{t^{1/2},\Delta}$ and $\tilde{F}^{(2)}_{t^{1/2},\Delta}$. By uniqueness,

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{F}^{(1)}_{t^{1/2},\Delta}(w,\rho) &= F^{(1)}_{t^{1/2},\Delta}(w,\rho) \\ \tilde{F}^{(2)}_{t^{1/2},\Delta}(w,\rho) &= F^{(2)}_{t^{1/2},\Delta}(t^{-1}w, t^{-\frac{1}{2}}\rho), \end{aligned}$$

i.e., $F^{(2)}_{t^{1/2},\Delta}(w,\rho) = \tilde{F}^{(2)}_{t^{1/2},\Delta}(tw, t^{1/2}\rho)$. Since $\tilde{F}^{(1)}_{t^{1/2}}$ and $\tilde{F}^{(2)}_{t^{1/2}}$ are analytic in $t^{1/2}$ not only when $0 < |t^{1/2}| \leq 1$, but also when $t^{1/2} = 0$, it must be that $t^{1/2} = 0$ is a removable singularity of $F^{(1)}_{t^{1/2}}$ and $F^{(2)}_{t^{1/2}}$. Finally, since $\rho(\tilde{F}^{(2)}_{t^{1/2}}(w,\rho))^0 = \rho \cdot O(w)$, and $\rho(\tilde{F}^{(2)}_{t^{1/2}}(w,\rho))^1 = \rho \cdot O(w)$, and for any $t^{1/2}$ with $|t^{1/2}| \leq 1$, the superfunction $\tilde{F}^{(2)}_{t^{1/2}}(w,\rho)$ is nonzero for $(w,\rho) \neq 0$, we see that $t^{1/2} = 0$ is a second-order zero of $(F^{(2)}_{t^{1/2}}(w,\rho))^0$ and a first-order zero of $(F^{(2)}_{t^{1/2}}(w,\rho))^1$. □

From Proposition 3.28, we have the formal series

$$\Psi_j(t^{\frac{1}{2}})(t^{-\frac{1}{2}}a^{(i)}_{\square}, A^{(i)}, M^{(i)}, B^{(0)}, N^{(0)}),$$

in $\bigwedge_\infty[[t^{1/2}]]$ for $j \in \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{Z}$, $(A^{(i)}, M^{(i)}), (B^{(0)}, N^{(0)}) \in \bigwedge_\infty^\infty$, and $a^{(i)}_{\square} \in (\bigwedge_\infty^0)^\times$. Let $\tilde{\Psi}_j(t^{1/2}) = \tilde{\Psi}_j(t^{1/2})(t^{-1/2}a^{(i)}_{\square}, A^{(i)}, M^{(i)}, B^{(0)}, N^{(0)})$, for $j \in \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{Z}$, be defined by

$$\left(1, \{\tilde{\Psi}_{-j}(t^{\frac{1}{2}}), -i\tilde{\Psi}_{-j+\frac{1}{2}}(t^{\frac{1}{2}})\}_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}\right) = \hat{E}^{-1}\big(I \circ F^{(1)}_{t^{1/2},\Delta} \circ s^{-1}_{(z_i,\theta_i)} \circ I^{-1}(x,\varphi)\big)$$

$$\left(t^{-\frac{1}{2}}a^{(i)}_{\square}\exp(\tilde{\Psi}_0(t^{\frac{1}{2}})), \{\tilde{\Psi}_j(t^{\frac{1}{2}}), \tilde{\Psi}_{j-\frac{1}{2}}(t^{\frac{1}{2}})\}_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}\right) = \hat{E}^{-1}\big(F^{(2)}_{t^{1/2},\Delta}(x,\varphi)\big).$$

Then we have the following proposition.

PROPOSITION 4.20. *Let* $Q_1 \in SK(m)$ *and* $Q_2 \in SK(n)$ *be given by*

$$Q_1 = \big((z_1, \theta_1), ..., (z_{m-1}, \theta_{m-1}); (A^{(0)}, M^{(0)}), (a_\square^{(1)}, A^{(1)}, M^{(1)}), \\ ..., (a_\square^{(m)}, A^{(m)}, M^{(m)})\big)$$

and

$$Q_2 = \big((z'_1, \theta'_1), ..., (z'_{n-1}, \theta'_{n-1}); (B^{(0)}, N^{(0)}), (b_\square^{(1)}, B^{(1)}, N^{(1)}), \\ ..., (b_\square^{(n)}, B^{(n)}, N^{(n)})\big)$$

for $m \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ *and* $n \in \mathbb{N}$. *If* $Q_1 \ {}_i\infty_0\ Q_2$ *exists, then the series* $\Psi_j(t^{1/2})$, *for* $j \in \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{Z}$, *are convergent when* $|t^{1/2}| \leq 1$, *and the values of these convergent series are equal to* $\tilde{\Psi}_j(t^{1/2})$.

PROOF. By Proposition 4.19, $F^{(1)}_{t^{1/2}}$ and $F^{(2)}_{t^{1/2}}$ are analytic in $t^{1/2}$ for $|t^{1/2}| \leq 1$, and therefore $F^{(1)}_{t^{1/2},\Delta} \circ s^{-1}_{(z_i,\theta_i)}(w,\rho)$ is also analytic in $t^{1/2}$ for $|t^{1/2}| \leq 1$. Thus $F^{(1)}_{t^{1/2},\Delta} \circ s^{-1}_{(z_i,\theta_i)}(w,\rho)$ and $F^{(2)}_{t^{1/2},\Delta}$ can be expanded as power series in $t^{1/2}$. The functions $\tilde{\Psi}_j(t^{1/2})$ as polynomials in the w and ρ coefficients of $F^{(1)}_{t^{1/2},\Delta} \circ s^{-1}_{(z_i,\theta_i)}(w,\rho)$ and $F^{(2)}_{t^{1/2},\Delta}(w,\rho)$ can also be expanded as power series in $t^{1/2}$. Since $F^{(1)}_{t^{1/2},\Delta} \circ s^{-1}_{(z_i,\theta_i)}(w,\rho)$ and $F^{(2)}_{t^{1/2},\Delta}(w,\rho)$ satisfy the sewing equation

$$F^{(1)}_{t^{1/2},\Delta}(w,\rho) = F^{(2)}_{t^{1/2},\Delta} \circ (H^{(2)}_{t^{1/2}})^{-1} \circ I \circ H^{(1)}_{t^{1/2}} \circ s_{(z_i,\theta_i)}(w,\rho)$$

or equivalently

$$F^{(1)}_{t^{1/2},\Delta} \circ s^{-1}_{(z_i,\theta_i)}(w,\rho) = F^{(2)}_{t^{1/2},\Delta} \circ (H^{(2)}_{t^{1/2}})^{-1} \circ I \circ H^{(1)}_{t^{1/2}}(w,\rho)$$

and the obvious boundary conditions, the formal series $F^{(1)}_{t^{1/2},\Delta} \circ s^{-1}_{(z_i,\theta_i)}(x,\varphi)$ and $F^{(2)}_{t^{1/2},\Delta}(x,\varphi)$ in $\bigwedge_\infty[[x,x^{-1}]][\varphi][[t^{1/2}]]$ corresponding to the expansions of $F^{(1)}_{t^{1/2},\Delta} \circ s^{-1}_{(z_i,\theta_i)}(w,\rho)$ and $F^{(2)}_{t^{1/2},\Delta}(w,\rho)$, respectively, satisfy the equation

$$F^{(1)}_{t^{1/2},\Delta} \circ s^{-1}_{(z_i,\theta_i)}(x,\varphi) = F^{(2)}_{t^{1/2},\Delta} \circ (H^{(2)}_{t^{1/2}})^{-1} \circ I \circ H^{(1)}_{t^{1/2}}(x,\varphi) \tag{4.40}$$

in $\bigwedge_\infty[[x,x^{-1}]][\varphi][[t^{1/2}]]$ and the corresponding formal boundary conditions. Note that the coefficients of the right-hand side of (4.40) are, in general, infinite sums. Thus $F^{(1)}_{t^{1/2},\Delta} \circ s^{-1}_{(z_i,\theta_i)}(x,\varphi)$ and $F^{(2)}_{t^{1/2},\Delta}(x,\varphi)$ satisfying (4.40) means that the coefficients of the right-hand side are absolutely convergent to the coefficients of the left-hand side.

Note that equation (4.40) and the corresponding formal boundary conditions can be obtained from the formal sewing equation and formal boundary conditions in Theorem 3.26 by substituting A_j, $M_{j-1/2}$, B_j, $N_{j-1/2}$, and $t^{-1/2}a_\square^{(i)}$ for $\mathcal{A}_j$, $\mathcal{M}_{j-1/2}$, $\mathcal{B}_j$, $\mathcal{N}_{j-1/2}$, and $\alpha_0^{1/2}$, respectively, for $j \in \mathbb{Z}_+$. Since the solution of the formal sewing equation and the formal boundary conditions in Theorem 3.26 is unique, the solution $F^{(1)}_{t^{1/2},\Delta} \circ s^{-1}_{(z_i,\theta_i)}(x,\varphi)$ and $F^{(2)}_{t^{1/2},\Delta}(x,\varphi)$ to formula (4.40) and the corresponding boundary conditions can be obtained by substituting A_j, $M_{j-1/2}$, B_j, $N_{j-1/2}$, and $t^{-1/2}a_\square^{(i)}$ for $\mathcal{A}_j$, $\mathcal{M}_{j-1/2}$, $\mathcal{B}_j$, $\mathcal{N}_{j-1/2}$, and $\alpha_0^{1/2}$, respectively, for

$j \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, into the solution of the formal sewing equation and the formal boundary conditions given in Theorem 3.26. Thus we have [4]

$$\hat{E}\Big(1, \big\{\tilde{\Psi}_{-j}(t^{\frac{1}{2}}), -i\tilde{\Psi}_{-j+\frac{1}{2}}(t^{\frac{1}{2}})\big\}_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}\Big)(x,\varphi) = I \circ F^{(1)}_{t^{1/2},\Delta} \circ s^{-1}_{(z_i,\theta_i)} \circ I^{-1}(x,\varphi) \tag{4.41}$$

and

$$\hat{E}\Big(t^{-\frac{1}{2}}a^{(i)}_{\Box}\exp(\tilde{\Psi}_0(t^{\frac{1}{2}})), \big\{\tilde{\Psi}_j(t^{\frac{1}{2}}), \tilde{\Psi}_{j-\frac{1}{2}}(t^{\frac{1}{2}})\big\}_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}\Big) = F^{(1)}_{t^{1/2},\Delta}(x,\varphi). \tag{4.42}$$

By the definition of $\tilde{\Psi}_j(t^{1/2})$, for $j \in \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{Z}$, the expansion of $\tilde{\Psi}_j(t^{1/2})$ is equal to $\Psi_j(t^{1/2})$ for $j \in \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{Z}$, i.e., $\Psi_j(t^{1/2})$ is convergent to $\tilde{\Psi}_j(t^{1/2})$ for $|t^{1/2}| \leq 1$. $\Box$

4.7. An $N = 1$ Neveu-Schwarz algebra structure of central charge zero on the supermeromorphic tangent space of $SK(1)$ at its identity

The super-moduli space $SK(1)$ of superspheres with $1+1$ tubes with the sewing operation is a partial monoid. But in general, elements of $SK(1)$ do not have inverses. In Lie theory, one uses invariant vector fields of a Lie group to define the Lie algebra. We will define a bracket operation on a subspace $\hat{T}_eSK(1)$ of the supermeromorphic tangent space $T_eSK(1)$ of $SK(1)$ at the identity e. We will then show that $\hat{T}_eSK(1)$ with this bracket operation is the Neveu-Schwarz algebra with central charge zero.

Let α_0, $\mathcal{A}^{(0)}_j$, $\mathcal{A}^{(1)}_j$, β_0, $\mathcal{B}^{(0)}_j$, and $\mathcal{B}^{(1)}_j$ be even formal variables, for $j \in \mathbb{Z}_+$; and let $\mathcal{M}^{(0)}_{j-1/2}$, $\mathcal{M}^{(1)}_{j-1/2}$, $\mathcal{N}^{(0)}_{j-1/2}$, and $\mathcal{N}^{(1)}_{j-1/2}$ be odd formal variables, for $j \in \mathbb{Z}_+$. For convenience, we will let use the notation

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{AM}^{(01)} &= ((\mathcal{A}^{(0)}, \mathcal{M}^{(0)}), (\alpha_0^{1/2}, \mathcal{A}^{(1)}, \mathcal{M}^{(1)})) \\ \mathcal{BN}^{(01)} &= ((\mathcal{B}^{(0)}, \mathcal{N}^{(0)}), (\beta_0^{1/2}, \mathcal{B}^{(1)}, \mathcal{N}^{(1)})). \end{aligned}$$

Define

$$\lambda_0^{\frac{1}{2}}(\mathcal{AM}^{(01)}, \mathcal{BN}^{(01)}), \Phi^{(0)}_j(\mathcal{AM}^{(01)}, \mathcal{BN}^{(01)}), \Phi^{(1)}_j(\mathcal{AM}^{(01)}, \mathcal{BN}^{(01)}) \in \mathbb{C}[\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{M}, \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{N}][[\alpha_0^{\frac{1}{2}}, \beta_0^{\frac{1}{2}}, \alpha_0^{-\frac{1}{2}}, \beta_0^{-\frac{1}{2}}]],$$

for $j \in \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{Z}_+$, by

$$\begin{aligned} &\Big(\Big\{\Phi^{(0)}_j(\mathcal{AM}^{(01)}, \mathcal{BN}^{(01)}), -i\Phi^{(0)}_{j-\frac{1}{2}}(\mathcal{AM}^{(01)}, \mathcal{BN}^{(01)})\Big\}_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}\Big) \\ &\quad = \tilde{E}^{-1}\Big(\tilde{E}\left(\mathcal{A}^{(0)}, -i\mathcal{M}^{(0)}\right) \circ \tilde{E}\Big(\Big\{-\Psi_{-j}(\alpha_0^{\frac{1}{2}}, \mathcal{A}^{(1)}, \mathcal{M}^{(1)}, \mathcal{B}^{(0)}, \mathcal{N}^{(0)}), \\ &\qquad\qquad i\Psi_{-j+\frac{1}{2}}(\alpha_0^{\frac{1}{2}}, \mathcal{A}^{(1)}, \mathcal{M}^{(1)}, \mathcal{B}^{(0)}, \mathcal{N}^{(0)})\Big\}_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}\Big)(x,\varphi)\Big) \end{aligned}$$

---

[4] There are a couple of misprints in the analogous nonsuper version to equation (4.41) and the setting for nonsuper version of the proof of Proposition 4.20 given in [**H2**]. In the proof of Proposition 3.4.5 in [**H2**], in the last paragraph on p.87, in both instances it should be stated that equation (3.4.2) and the corresponding formal boundary conditions can be obtained from the formal sewing equation and formal boundary conditions in Theorem 2.2.4 by substituting A_j, B_j, $j \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ and $t^{-1}a_0^{(i)}$, not A_j, t^jB_j, $j \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ and $t^{-j}a_0^{(i)}$ as stated, for $\mathcal{A}_j$, $\mathcal{B}_j$, $j \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ and α_0, respectively. In addition, the first displayed equation on p.88, should read $1/F^{(1)}_t(x^{-1} + z_i) = \hat{E}(1, \{\Psi_{-j}(t)\}_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+})$, not $F^{(1)}_t(x + z_i) = \hat{E}(1, \{\Psi_{-j}(t)\}_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+})$ as stated.

and

$$\begin{aligned}
&\Big(\lambda_0^{\frac{1}{2}}(\mathcal{AM}^{(01)},\mathcal{BN}^{(01)}), \Big\{\Phi_j^{(1)}(\mathcal{AM}^{(01)},\mathcal{BN}^{(01)}), \Phi_{j-\frac{1}{2}}^{(1)}(\mathcal{AM}^{(01)},\mathcal{BN}^{(01)})\Big\}_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}\Big)\\
&\quad = \hat{E}^{-1}\Big(\hat{E}\big(\beta_0^{\frac{1}{2}},\mathcal{B}^{(1)},\mathcal{N}^{(1)}\big)\circ\hat{E}\Big(\alpha_0^{\frac{1}{2}}\exp(-\Psi_0(\alpha_0^{\frac{1}{2}},\mathcal{A}^{(1)},\mathcal{M}^{(1)},\mathcal{B}^{(0)},\mathcal{N}^{(0)})),\\
&\Big\{-\Psi_j(\alpha_0^{\frac{1}{2}},\mathcal{A}^{(1)},\mathcal{M}^{(1)},\mathcal{B}^{(0)},\mathcal{N}^{(0)}), -\Psi_{j-\frac{1}{2}}(\alpha_0^{\frac{1}{2}},\mathcal{A}^{(1)},\mathcal{M}^{(1)},\mathcal{B}^{(0)},\mathcal{N}^{(0)})\Big\}_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}\Big)\\
&\hspace{20em}(x,\varphi)\Big).
\end{aligned}$$

Formally, these series give the coordinates of the supersphere

$$\mathcal{AM}^{(01)}\ {}_1\infty_0\ \mathcal{BN}^{(01)}\in SK(2)$$

at infinity and zero, respectively. For convenience, we denote the resulting supersphere

$$\begin{aligned}
&\Big(\Big(\Big\{\Phi_j^{(0)}(\mathcal{AM}^{(01)},\mathcal{BN}^{(01)}), \Phi_{j-\frac{1}{2}}^{(0)}(\mathcal{AM}^{(01)},\mathcal{BN}^{(01)})\Big\}_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}\Big),\\
&\Big(\lambda_0^{\frac{1}{2}}(\mathcal{AM}^{(01)},\mathcal{BN}^{(01)}), \Big\{\Phi_j^{(1)}(\mathcal{AM}^{(01)},\mathcal{BN}^{(01)}), \Phi_{j-\frac{1}{2}}^{(1)}(\mathcal{AM}^{(01)},\mathcal{BN}^{(01)})\Big\}_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}\Big)\Big)
\end{aligned}$$

by

$$\Phi^{(01)}(\mathcal{AM}^{(01)},\mathcal{BN}^{(01)}).$$

Writing

$$\Phi_j^{(k)}=\Phi_j^{(k)}(\mathcal{AM}^{(01)},\mathcal{BN}^{(01)}),$$

for $k=0,1$ and $j\in\frac{1}{2}\mathbb{Z}_+$,

$$\lambda_0^{\frac{1}{2}}=\lambda_0^{\frac{1}{2}}(\mathcal{AM}^{(01)},\mathcal{BN}^{(01)}),$$

and

$$\Psi_j=\Psi_j(\alpha_0^{\frac{1}{2}},\mathcal{A}^{(1)},\mathcal{M}^{(1)},\mathcal{B}^{(0)},\mathcal{N}^{(0)}),$$

for $j\in\frac{1}{2}\mathbb{Z}$, we can give the local coordinates of $\Phi^{(01)}(\mathcal{AM}^{(01)},\mathcal{BN}^{(01)})$ at infinity and zero explicitly by

$$\begin{aligned}
&\exp\Big(\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}\big(\Phi_j^{(0)}L_{-j}(x,\varphi)+\Phi_{j-\frac{1}{2}}^{(0)}G_{-j+\frac{1}{2}}(x,\varphi)\big)\Big)\cdot\Big(\frac{1}{x},\frac{i\varphi}{x}\Big)\\
&\qquad = \exp\Big(-\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}\big(\Psi_{-j}L_{-j}(x,\varphi)+\Psi_{-j+\frac{1}{2}}G_{-j+\frac{1}{2}}(x,\varphi)\Big)\cdot\\
&\qquad\qquad \exp\Big(\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}\big(\mathcal{A}_j^{(0)}L_{-j}(x,\varphi)+\mathcal{M}_{j-\frac{1}{2}}^{(0)}G_{-j+\frac{1}{2}}(x,\varphi)\big)\Big)\cdot\Big(\frac{1}{x},\frac{i\varphi}{x}\Big)
\end{aligned}$$

for the local coordinate at infinity, and

$$\begin{aligned}
&\exp\Big(-\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}\big(\Phi_j^{(1)}L_j(x,\varphi)+\Phi_{j-\frac{1}{2}}^{(1)}G_{j-\frac{1}{2}}(x,\varphi)\big)\Big)\cdot(\lambda_0^{\frac{1}{2}})^{-L_0(x,\varphi)}\cdot(x,\varphi)\\
&= \exp\Big(\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}\big(\Psi_jL_j(x,\varphi)+\Psi_{j-\frac{1}{2}}G_{j-\frac{1}{2}}(x,\varphi)\big)\Big)\cdot(\alpha_0^{\frac{1}{2}})^{-L_0(x,\varphi)}\cdot\exp(\Psi_0L_0(x,\varphi))\cdot\\
&\qquad \exp\Big(-\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}\big(\mathcal{B}_j^{(1)}L_j(x,\varphi)+\mathcal{N}_{j-\frac{1}{2}}^{(1)}G_{j-\frac{1}{2}}(x,\varphi)\big)\Big)\cdot(\beta_0^{\frac{1}{2}})^{-L_0(x,\varphi)}\cdot(x,\varphi),
\end{aligned}\tag{4.43}$$

for the local coordinate at zero. [5] It is obvious that

$$\Phi^{(01)}(\mathcal{AM}^{(01)}, e) = \mathcal{AM}^{(01)}, \quad \text{and} \quad \Phi^{(01)}(e, \mathcal{BN}^{(01)}) = \mathcal{BN}^{(01)}. \tag{4.44}$$

Let $\hat{T}_eSK(1)$ be the subspace of $T_eSK(1)$ (the supermeromorphic tangent space of $SK(1)$ at e) consisting of all finite linear combinations of $-\frac{\partial}{\partial a}\big|_e$, $-\frac{\partial}{\partial A_j^{(0)}}\Big|_e$, $-\frac{\partial}{\partial M_{j-1/2}^{(0)}}\Big|_e$, $-\frac{\partial}{\partial A_j^{(1)}}\Big|_e$, and $-\frac{\partial}{\partial M_{j-1/2}^{(1)}}\Big|_e$, for $j \in \mathbb{Z}_+$. Let $F \in SD(0)$. We will use the notation

$$F(\Phi^{(01)}(\mathcal{AM}^{(01)}, \mathcal{BN}^{(01)}))\Big|_e = F(\Phi^{(01)}(\mathcal{AM}^{(01)}, \mathcal{BN}^{(01)}))\Big|_{\substack{\mathcal{AM}^{(01)} = \\ \mathcal{BN}^{(01)} = e}} .$$

We define a bracket operation on $\hat{T}_eSK(1)$ as follows: For $j, k \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, let

$$\left[\frac{\partial}{\partial A_j^{(0)}}\bigg|_e, \frac{\partial}{\partial A_k^{(0)}}\bigg|_e\right]F$$
$$= \left(\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \mathcal{A}_j^{(0)}}\frac{\partial}{\partial \mathcal{B}_k^{(0)}} - \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathcal{A}_k^{(0)}}\frac{\partial}{\partial \mathcal{B}_j^{(0)}}\right)F(\Phi^{(01)}(\mathcal{AM}^{(01)}, \mathcal{BN}^{(01)}))\right)\bigg|_e;$$

$$\left[\frac{\partial}{\partial a}\bigg|_e, \frac{\partial}{\partial A_j^{(0)}}\bigg|_e\right]F$$
$$= \left(\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \alpha_0^{\frac{1}{2}}}\frac{\partial}{\partial \mathcal{B}_j^{(0)}} - \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathcal{A}_j^{(0)}}\frac{\partial}{\partial \alpha_0^{\frac{1}{2}}}\right)F(\Phi^{(01)}(\mathcal{AM}^{(01)}, \mathcal{BN}^{(01)}))\right)\bigg|_e;$$

when $j \geq k$, let

$$\left[\frac{\partial}{\partial A_j^{(1)}}\bigg|_e, \frac{\partial}{\partial A_k^{(0)}}\bigg|_e\right]F$$
$$= \left(\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \mathcal{A}_j^{(1)}}\frac{\partial}{\partial \mathcal{B}_k^{(0)}} - \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathcal{B}_k^{(0)}}\frac{\partial}{\partial \mathcal{B}_j^{(1)}}\right)F(\Phi^{(01)}(\mathcal{AM}^{(01)}, \mathcal{BN}^{(01)}))\right)\bigg|_e;$$

when $j < k$, let

$$\left[\frac{\partial}{\partial A_j^{(1)}}\bigg|_e, \frac{\partial}{\partial A_k^{(0)}}\bigg|_e\right]F$$
$$= \left(\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \mathcal{A}_j^{(1)}}\frac{\partial}{\partial \mathcal{B}_k^{(0)}} - \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathcal{A}_k^{(0)}}\frac{\partial}{\partial \mathcal{A}_j^{(1)}}\right)F(\Phi^{(01)}(\mathcal{AM}^{(01)}, \mathcal{BN}^{(01)}))\right)\bigg|_e;$$

$$\left[\frac{\partial}{\partial a}\bigg|_e, \frac{\partial}{\partial A_j^{(1)}}\bigg|_e\right]F$$
$$= \left(\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \alpha_0^{\frac{1}{2}}}\frac{\partial}{\partial \mathcal{B}_j^{(1)}} - \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathcal{A}_j^{(1)}}\frac{\partial}{\partial \beta_0^{\frac{1}{2}}}\right)F(\Phi^{(01)}(\mathcal{AM}^{(01)}, \mathcal{BN}^{(01)}))\right)\bigg|_e;$$

---

[5] There is a misprint to the analogous nonsuper case to equation (4.43) given in [**H2**]. On p.90 of [**H2**], the right-hand side of the equation giving the coordinate at zero which is equal to $\lambda_0(\mathcal{A}^{(01)}, \mathcal{B}^{(01)})e_{\Lambda^{(1)}(\mathcal{A}^{(01)}, \mathcal{B}^{(01)})}(x)x$ should be acting on x.

$$\left[\frac{\partial}{\partial A_j^{(1)}}\bigg|_e, \frac{\partial}{\partial A_k^{(1)}}\bigg|_e\right]F$$
$$= \left(\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \mathcal{A}_j^{(1)}}\frac{\partial}{\partial \mathcal{B}_k^{(1)}} - \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathcal{A}_k^{(1)}}\frac{\partial}{\partial \mathcal{B}_j^{(1)}}\right)F(\Phi^{(01)}(\mathcal{A}\mathcal{M}^{(01)}, \mathcal{B}\mathcal{N}^{(01)}))\right)\bigg|_e;$$

$$\left[\frac{\partial}{\partial M_{j-\frac{1}{2}}^{(0)}}\Bigg|_e, \frac{\partial}{\partial M_{k-\frac{1}{2}}^{(0)}}\Bigg|_e\right]F$$
$$= \left(\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \mathcal{M}_{j-\frac{1}{2}}^{(0)}}\frac{\partial}{\partial \mathcal{N}_{k-\frac{1}{2}}^{(0)}} + \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathcal{M}_{k-\frac{1}{2}}^{(0)}}\frac{\partial}{\partial \mathcal{N}_{j-\frac{1}{2}}^{(0)}}\right)F(\Phi^{(01)}(\mathcal{A}\mathcal{M}^{(01)}, \mathcal{B}\mathcal{N}^{(01)}))\right)\Bigg|_e;$$

$$\left[\frac{\partial}{\partial M_{j-\frac{1}{2}}^{(1)}}\Bigg|_e, \frac{\partial}{\partial M_{k-\frac{1}{2}}^{(0)}}\Bigg|_e\right]F$$
$$= \left(\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \mathcal{M}_{j-\frac{1}{2}}^{(1)}}\frac{\partial}{\partial \mathcal{N}_{k-\frac{1}{2}}^{(0)}} + \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathcal{M}_{k-\frac{1}{2}}^{(0)}}\frac{\partial}{\partial \mathcal{M}_{j-\frac{1}{2}}^{(1)}}\right)F(\Phi^{(01)}(\mathcal{A}\mathcal{M}^{(01)}, \mathcal{B}\mathcal{N}^{(01)}))\right)\Bigg|_e;$$

$$\left[\frac{\partial}{\partial M_{j-\frac{1}{2}}^{(1)}}\Bigg|_e, \frac{\partial}{\partial M_{k-\frac{1}{2}}^{(1)}}\Bigg|_e\right]F$$
$$= \left(\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \mathcal{M}_{j-\frac{1}{2}}^{(1)}}\frac{\partial}{\partial \mathcal{N}_{k-\frac{1}{2}}^{(1)}} + \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathcal{M}_{k-\frac{1}{2}}^{(1)}}\frac{\partial}{\partial \mathcal{N}_{j-\frac{1}{2}}^{(1)}}\right)F(\Phi^{(01)}(\mathcal{A}\mathcal{M}^{(01)}, \mathcal{B}\mathcal{N}^{(01)}))\right)\Bigg|_e;$$

$$\left[\frac{\partial}{\partial A_j^{(0)}}\bigg|_e, \frac{\partial}{\partial M_{k-\frac{1}{2}}^{(0)}}\Bigg|_e\right]F$$
$$= \left(\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \mathcal{A}_j^{(0)}}\frac{\partial}{\partial \mathcal{N}_{k-\frac{1}{2}}^{(0)}} - \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathcal{M}_{k-\frac{1}{2}}^{(0)}}\frac{\partial}{\partial \mathcal{B}_j^{(0)}}\right)F(\Phi^{(01)}(\mathcal{A}\mathcal{M}^{(01)}, \mathcal{B}\mathcal{N}^{(01)}))\right)\Bigg|_e;$$

$$\left[\frac{\partial}{\partial a}\bigg|_e, \frac{\partial}{\partial M_{j-\frac{1}{2}}^{(0)}}\Bigg|_e\right]F$$
$$= \left(\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \alpha_0^{\frac{1}{2}}}\frac{\partial}{\partial \mathcal{N}_{j-\frac{1}{2}}^{(0)}} - \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathcal{M}_{j-\frac{1}{2}}^{(0)}}\frac{\partial}{\partial \alpha_0^{\frac{1}{2}}}\right)F(\Phi^{(01)}(\mathcal{A}\mathcal{M}^{(01)}, \mathcal{B}\mathcal{N}^{(01)}))\right)\Bigg|_e;$$

when $j \geq k$, let

$$\left[\frac{\partial}{\partial A_j^{(1)}}\bigg|_e, \frac{\partial}{\partial M_{k-\frac{1}{2}}^{(0)}}\Bigg|_e\right]F$$
$$= \left(\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \mathcal{A}_j^{(1)}}\frac{\partial}{\partial \mathcal{N}_{k-\frac{1}{2}}^{(0)}} - \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathcal{N}_{k-\frac{1}{2}}^{(0)}}\frac{\partial}{\partial \mathcal{B}_j^{(1)}}\right)F(\Phi^{(01)}(\mathcal{A}\mathcal{M}^{(01)}, \mathcal{B}\mathcal{N}^{(01)}))\right)\Bigg|_e;$$

when $j < k$, let

$$\left[\frac{\partial}{\partial A_j^{(1)}}\bigg|_e, \frac{\partial}{\partial M_{k-\frac{1}{2}}^{(0)}}\bigg|_e\right]F$$
$$= \left(\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \mathcal{A}_j^{(1)}}\frac{\partial}{\partial \mathcal{N}_{k-\frac{1}{2}}^{(0)}} - \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathcal{M}_{k-\frac{1}{2}}^{(0)}}\frac{\partial}{\partial \mathcal{A}_j^{(1)}}\right)F(\Phi^{(01)}(\mathcal{A}\mathcal{M}^{(01)}, \mathcal{B}\mathcal{N}^{(01)}))\right)\bigg|_e;$$

when $j \geq k$, let

$$\left[\frac{\partial}{\partial M_{j-\frac{1}{2}}^{(1)}}\bigg|_e, \frac{\partial}{\partial A_k^{(0)}}\bigg|_e\right]F$$
$$= \left(\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \mathcal{M}_{j-\frac{1}{2}}^{(1)}}\frac{\partial}{\partial \mathcal{B}_k^{(0)}} - \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathcal{B}_k^{(0)}}\frac{\partial}{\partial \mathcal{N}_{j-\frac{1}{2}}^{(1)}}\right)F(\Phi^{(01)}(\mathcal{A}\mathcal{M}^{(01)}, \mathcal{B}\mathcal{N}^{(01)}))\right)\bigg|_e;$$

when $j < k$, let

$$\left[\frac{\partial}{\partial M_{j-\frac{1}{2}}^{(1)}}\bigg|_e, \frac{\partial}{\partial A_k^{(0)}}\bigg|_e\right]F$$
$$= \left(\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \mathcal{M}_{j-\frac{1}{2}}^{(1)}}\frac{\partial}{\partial \mathcal{B}_k^{(0)}} - \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathcal{A}_k^{(0)}}\frac{\partial}{\partial \mathcal{M}_{j-\frac{1}{2}}^{(1)}}\right)F(\Phi^{(01)}(\mathcal{A}\mathcal{M}^{(01)}, \mathcal{B}\mathcal{N}^{(01)}))\right)\bigg|_e;$$

$$\left[\frac{\partial}{\partial a}\bigg|_e, \frac{\partial}{\partial M_{j-\frac{1}{2}}^{(1)}}\bigg|_e\right]F$$
$$= \left(\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \alpha_0^{\frac{1}{2}}}\frac{\partial}{\partial \mathcal{N}_{j-\frac{1}{2}}^{(1)}} - \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathcal{M}_{j-\frac{1}{2}}^{(1)}}\frac{\partial}{\partial \beta_0^{\frac{1}{2}}}\right)F(\Phi^{(01)}(\mathcal{A}\mathcal{M}^{(01)}, \mathcal{B}\mathcal{N}^{(01)}))\right)\bigg|_e;$$

$$\left[\frac{\partial}{\partial A_j^{(1)}}\bigg|_e, \frac{\partial}{\partial M_{k-\frac{1}{2}}^{(1)}}\bigg|_e\right]F$$
$$= \left(\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \mathcal{A}_j^{(1)}}\frac{\partial}{\partial \mathcal{N}_{k-\frac{1}{2}}^{(1)}} - \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathcal{M}_{k-\frac{1}{2}}^{(1)}}\frac{\partial}{\partial \mathcal{B}_j^{(1)}}\right)F(\Phi^{(01)}(\mathcal{A}\mathcal{M}^{(01)}, \mathcal{B}\mathcal{N}^{(01)}))\right)\bigg|_e.$$

PROPOSITION 4.21. *The vector space $\hat{T}_eSK(1)$ with the bracket operation defined above is the Neveu-Schwarz algebra with central charge zero. The basis is* *given by*

$$\mathcal{L}(j) = -\frac{\partial}{\partial A^{(0)}_{-j}}\bigg|_e, \quad \textit{for} \ \ -j \in \mathbb{Z}_+, \tag{4.45}$$

$$\mathcal{L}(j) = -\frac{\partial}{\partial A^{(1)}_{j}}\bigg|_e, \quad \textit{for} \ \ j \in \mathbb{Z}_+, \tag{4.46}$$

$$\mathcal{L}(0) = -\frac{1}{2}\frac{\partial}{\partial a}\bigg|_e, \tag{4.47}$$

$$\mathcal{G}(j+\frac{1}{2}) = -\frac{\partial}{\partial M^{(0)}_{-j-\frac{1}{2}}}\bigg|_e, \quad \textit{for} \ \ -j \in \mathbb{Z}_+, \tag{4.48}$$

$$\mathcal{G}(j-\frac{1}{2}) = -\frac{\partial}{\partial M^{(1)}_{j-\frac{1}{2}}}\bigg|_e, \quad \textit{for} \ \ j \in \mathbb{Z}_+. \tag{4.49}$$

Proof. We prove the bracket formula for

$$\Big[\mathcal{G}(j+\frac{1}{2}), \mathcal{G}(k-\frac{1}{2})\Big] = 2\mathcal{L}(j+k)$$

for $-j \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, $k \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, and $-j < k$. The proofs for the other cases are similar. To simplify notation, we will write, for example,

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \Phi^{(0)}_k} F(\Phi^{(01)})\bigg|_e$$

instead of

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \Phi^{(0)}_k(\mathcal{AM}^{(01)}, \mathcal{BN}^{(01)})} F(\Phi^{(01)}(\mathcal{AM}^{(01)}, \mathcal{BN}^{(01)}))\bigg|_{\substack{\mathcal{AM}^{(01)} = \\ \mathcal{BN}^{(01)} = e}}.$$

For $-j \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ and $k \in \mathbb{Z}_+$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\Big[\mathcal{G}(j+\frac{1}{2}), \mathcal{G}(k-\frac{1}{2})\Big]F \\
&\quad = \left[\frac{\partial}{\partial M^{(0)}_{-j-\frac{1}{2}}}\bigg|_e, \frac{\partial}{\partial M^{(1)}_{k-\frac{1}{2}}}\bigg|_e\right]F \\
&\quad = \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \mathcal{M}^{(1)}_{k-\frac{1}{2}}}\frac{\partial}{\partial \mathcal{N}^{(0)}_{-j-\frac{1}{2}}} + \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathcal{M}^{(0)}_{-j-\frac{1}{2}}}\frac{\partial}{\partial \mathcal{M}^{(1)}_{k-\frac{1}{2}}}\right)F(\Phi^{(01)})\bigg|_e \\
&\quad = \sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}_+}\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \mathcal{M}^{(1)}_{k-\frac{1}{2}}}\frac{\partial}{\partial \mathcal{N}^{(0)}_{-j-\frac{1}{2}}}\Phi^{(0)}_n\bigg|_e \frac{\partial}{\partial \Phi^{(0)}_n}F(\Phi^{(01)})\bigg|_e - \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathcal{N}^{(0)}_{-j-\frac{1}{2}}}\Phi^{(0)}_n\bigg|_e \cdot\right. \\
&\qquad \cdot\frac{\partial}{\partial \mathcal{M}^{(1)}_{k-\frac{1}{2}}}\frac{\partial}{\partial \Phi^{(0)}_n}F(\Phi^{(01)})\bigg|_e + \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathcal{M}^{(1)}_{k-\frac{1}{2}}}\frac{\partial}{\partial \mathcal{N}^{(0)}_{-j-\frac{1}{2}}}\Phi^{(0)}_{n-\frac{1}{2}}\bigg|_e \frac{\partial}{\partial \Phi^{(0)}_{n-\frac{1}{2}}}F(\Phi^{(01)})\bigg|_e \\
&\qquad \left. - \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathcal{N}^{(0)}_{-j-\frac{1}{2}}}\Phi^{(0)}_{n-\frac{1}{2}}\bigg|_e \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathcal{M}^{(1)}_{k-\frac{1}{2}}}\frac{\partial}{\partial \Phi^{(0)}_{n-\frac{1}{2}}}F(\Phi^{(01)})\bigg|_e\right)
\end{aligned} \tag{4.50}$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&+\frac{\partial}{\partial \mathcal{M}^{(1)}_{k-\frac{1}{2}}}\frac{\partial}{\partial \mathcal{N}^{(0)}_{-j-\frac{1}{2}}}\lambda_0^{\frac{1}{2}}\Bigg|_e \frac{\partial}{\partial \lambda_0^{\frac{1}{2}}}F(\Phi^{(01)})\Bigg|_e \\
&\qquad\qquad -\frac{\partial}{\partial \mathcal{N}^{(0)}_{-j-\frac{1}{2}}}\lambda_0^{\frac{1}{2}}\Bigg|_e \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathcal{M}^{(1)}_{k-\frac{1}{2}}}\frac{\partial}{\partial \lambda_0^{\frac{1}{2}}}F(\Phi^{(01)})\Bigg|_e
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&+\sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}_+}\Bigg(\frac{\partial}{\partial \mathcal{M}^{(1)}_{k-\frac{1}{2}}}\frac{\partial}{\partial \mathcal{N}^{(0)}_{-j-\frac{1}{2}}}\Phi^{(1)}_n\Bigg|_e \frac{\partial}{\partial \Phi^{(1)}_n}F(\Phi^{(01)})\Bigg|_e -\frac{\partial}{\partial \mathcal{N}^{(0)}_{-j-\frac{1}{2}}}\Phi^{(1)}_n\Bigg|_e \cdot \\
&\cdot\frac{\partial}{\partial \mathcal{M}^{(1)}_{k-\frac{1}{2}}}\frac{\partial}{\partial \Phi^{(1)}_n}F(\Phi^{(01)})\Bigg|_e +\frac{\partial}{\partial \mathcal{M}^{(1)}_{k-\frac{1}{2}}}\frac{\partial}{\partial \mathcal{N}^{(0)}_{-j-\frac{1}{2}}}\Phi^{(1)}_{n-\frac{1}{2}}\Bigg|_e \frac{\partial}{\partial \Phi^{(1)}_{n-\frac{1}{2}}}F(\Phi^{(01)})\Bigg|_e \\
&\qquad\qquad -\frac{\partial}{\partial \mathcal{N}^{(0)}_{-j-\frac{1}{2}}}\Phi^{(1)}_{n-\frac{1}{2}}\Bigg|_e \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathcal{M}^{(1)}_{k-\frac{1}{2}}}\frac{\partial}{\partial \Phi^{(1)}_{n-\frac{1}{2}}}F(\Phi^{(01)})\Bigg|_e\Bigg)
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&+\sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}_+}\Bigg(\frac{\partial}{\partial \mathcal{M}^{(0)}_{-j-\frac{1}{2}}}\frac{\partial}{\partial \mathcal{M}^{(1)}_{k-\frac{1}{2}}}\Phi^{(0)}_n\Bigg|_e \frac{\partial}{\partial \Phi^{(0)}_n}F(\Phi^{(01)})\Bigg|_e -\frac{\partial}{\partial \mathcal{M}^{(1)}_{k-\frac{1}{2}}}\Phi^{(0)}_n\Bigg|_e \cdot \\
&\cdot\frac{\partial}{\partial \mathcal{M}^{(0)}_{-j-\frac{1}{2}}}\frac{\partial}{\partial \Phi^{(0)}_n}F(\Phi^{(01)})\Bigg|_e +\frac{\partial}{\partial \mathcal{M}^{(0)}_{-j-\frac{1}{2}}}\frac{\partial}{\partial \mathcal{M}^{(1)}_{k-\frac{1}{2}}}\Phi^{(0)}_{n-\frac{1}{2}}\Bigg|_e \frac{\partial}{\partial \Phi^{(0)}_{n-\frac{1}{2}}}F(\Phi^{(01)})\Bigg|_e \\
&\qquad\qquad -\frac{\partial}{\partial \mathcal{M}^{(1)}_{k-\frac{1}{2}}}\Phi^{(0)}_{n-\frac{1}{2}}\Bigg|_e \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathcal{M}^{(0)}_{-j-\frac{1}{2}}}\frac{\partial}{\partial \Phi^{(0)}_{n-\frac{1}{2}}}F(\Phi^{(01)})\Bigg|_e\Bigg)
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&+\frac{\partial}{\partial \mathcal{M}^{(0)}_{-j-\frac{1}{2}}}\frac{\partial}{\partial \mathcal{M}^{(1)}_{k-\frac{1}{2}}}\lambda_0^{\frac{1}{2}}\Bigg|_e \frac{\partial}{\partial \lambda_0^{\frac{1}{2}}}F(\Phi^{(01)})\Bigg|_e \\
&\qquad\qquad -\frac{\partial}{\partial \mathcal{M}^{(1)}_{k-\frac{1}{2}}}\lambda_0^{\frac{1}{2}}\Bigg|_e \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathcal{M}^{(0)}_{-j-\frac{1}{2}}}\frac{\partial}{\partial \lambda_0^{\frac{1}{2}}}F(\Phi^{(01)})\Bigg|_e
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&+\sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}_+}\Bigg(\frac{\partial}{\partial \mathcal{M}^{(0)}_{-j-\frac{1}{2}}}\frac{\partial}{\partial \mathcal{M}^{(1)}_{k-\frac{1}{2}}}\Phi^{(1)}_n\Bigg|_e \frac{\partial}{\partial \Phi^{(1)}_n}F(\Phi^{(01)})\Bigg|_e -\frac{\partial}{\partial \mathcal{M}^{(1)}_{k-\frac{1}{2}}}\Phi^{(1)}_n\Bigg|_e \cdot \\
&\cdot\frac{\partial}{\partial \mathcal{M}^{(0)}_{-j-\frac{1}{2}}}\frac{\partial}{\partial \Phi^{(1)}_n}F(\Phi^{(01)})\Bigg|_e +\frac{\partial}{\partial \mathcal{M}^{(0)}_{-j-\frac{1}{2}}}\frac{\partial}{\partial \mathcal{M}^{(1)}_{k-\frac{1}{2}}}\Phi^{(1)}_{n-\frac{1}{2}}\Bigg|_e \frac{\partial}{\partial \Phi^{(1)}_{n-\frac{1}{2}}}F(\Phi^{(01)})\Bigg|_e \\
&\qquad\qquad -\frac{\partial}{\partial \mathcal{M}^{(1)}_{k-\frac{1}{2}}}\Phi^{(1)}_{n-\frac{1}{2}}\Bigg|_e \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathcal{M}^{(0)}_{-j-\frac{1}{2}}}\frac{\partial}{\partial \Phi^{(1)}_{n-\frac{1}{2}}}F(\Phi^{(01)})\Bigg|_e\Bigg).
\end{aligned}
$$

Using 4.44, we have

$$\begin{array}{rclrcl}
\left.\frac{\partial}{\partial \mathcal{N}^{(0)}_{-j-\frac{1}{2}}}\Phi^{(0)}_{n}\right|_{e} & = & 0, & \left.\frac{\partial}{\partial \mathcal{M}^{(1)}_{k-\frac{1}{2}}}\Phi^{(0)}_{n}\right|_{e} & = & 0, \\
\left.\frac{\partial}{\partial \mathcal{N}^{(0)}_{-j-\frac{1}{2}}}\Phi^{(0)}_{n-\frac{1}{2}}\right|_{e} & = & \delta_{n,-j}, & \left.\frac{\partial}{\partial \mathcal{M}^{(1)}_{k-\frac{1}{2}}}\Phi^{(0)}_{n-\frac{1}{2}}\right|_{e} & = & 0, \\
\left.\frac{\partial}{\partial \mathcal{N}^{(0)}_{-j-\frac{1}{2}}}\lambda^{\frac{1}{2}}_{0}\right|_{e} & = & 0, & \left.\frac{\partial}{\partial \mathcal{M}^{(1)}_{k-\frac{1}{2}}}\lambda^{\frac{1}{2}}_{0}\right|_{e} & = & 0, \\
\left.\frac{\partial}{\partial \mathcal{N}^{(0)}_{-j-\frac{1}{2}}}\Phi^{(1)}_{n}\right|_{e} & = & 0, & \left.\frac{\partial}{\partial \mathcal{M}^{(1)}_{k-\frac{1}{2}}}\Phi^{(1)}_{n}\right|_{e} & = & 0, \\
\left.\frac{\partial}{\partial \mathcal{N}^{(0)}_{-j-\frac{1}{2}}}\Phi^{(1)}_{n-\frac{1}{2}}\right|_{e} & = & 0, & \left.\frac{\partial}{\partial \mathcal{M}^{(1)}_{k-\frac{1}{2}}}\Phi^{(1)}_{n-\frac{1}{2}}\right|_{e} & = & \delta_{n,k}.
\end{array}$$

Also, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left.\frac{\partial}{\partial \mathcal{M}^{(1)}_{k-\frac{1}{2}}}\frac{\partial}{\partial \Phi^{(0)}_{n-\frac{1}{2}}}F(\Phi^{(01)})\right|_{e} \\
&\quad = \sum_{m\in\mathbb{Z}_{+}}\left(\left.\frac{\partial}{\partial \mathcal{M}^{(1)}_{k-\frac{1}{2}}}\Phi^{(0)}_{m}\right|_{e}\left.\frac{\partial}{\partial \Phi^{(0)}_{m}}\frac{\partial}{\partial \Phi^{(0)}_{n-\frac{1}{2}}}F(\Phi^{(01)})\right|_{e}\right. \\
&\qquad\qquad \left. + \left.\frac{\partial}{\partial \mathcal{M}^{(1)}_{k-\frac{1}{2}}}\Phi^{(0)}_{m-\frac{1}{2}}\right|_{e}\left.\frac{\partial}{\partial \Phi^{(0)}_{m-\frac{1}{2}}}\frac{\partial}{\partial \Phi^{(0)}_{n-\frac{1}{2}}}F(\Phi^{(01)})\right|_{e}\right) \\
&\qquad + \left.\frac{\partial}{\partial \mathcal{M}^{(1)}_{k-\frac{1}{2}}}\lambda^{\frac{1}{2}}_{0}\right|_{e}\left.\frac{\partial}{\partial \lambda^{\frac{1}{2}}_{0}}\frac{\partial}{\partial \Phi^{(0)}_{n-\frac{1}{2}}}F(\Phi^{(01)})\right|_{e} \\
&\qquad + \sum_{m\in\mathbb{Z}_{+}}\left(\left.\frac{\partial}{\partial \mathcal{M}^{(1)}_{k-\frac{1}{2}}}\Phi^{(1)}_{m}\right|_{e}\left.\frac{\partial}{\partial \Phi^{(1)}_{m}}\frac{\partial}{\partial \Phi^{(0)}_{n-\frac{1}{2}}}F(\Phi^{(01)})\right|_{e}\right. \\
&\qquad\qquad \left. + \left.\frac{\partial}{\partial \mathcal{M}^{(1)}_{k-\frac{1}{2}}}\Phi^{(1)}_{m-\frac{1}{2}}\right|_{e}\left.\frac{\partial}{\partial \Phi^{(1)}_{m-\frac{1}{2}}}\frac{\partial}{\partial \Phi^{(0)}_{n-\frac{1}{2}}}F(\Phi^{(01)})\right|_{e}\right) \\
&\quad = \left.\frac{\partial}{\partial \Phi^{(1)}_{k-\frac{1}{2}}}\frac{\partial}{\partial \Phi^{(0)}_{n-\frac{1}{2}}}F(\Phi^{(01)})\right|_{e},
\end{aligned}$$

and similarly

$$\left.\frac{\partial}{\partial \mathcal{M}^{(0)}_{n-\frac{1}{2}}}\frac{\partial}{\partial \Phi^{(1)}_{k-\frac{1}{2}}}F(\Phi^{(01)})\right|_{e} = \left.\frac{\partial}{\partial \Phi^{(0)}_{n-\frac{1}{2}}}\frac{\partial}{\partial \Phi^{(1)}_{k-\frac{1}{2}}}F(\Phi^{(01)}\right|_{e}.$$

For simplicity we will write $\Psi_n = \Psi_n({\alpha_0}^{1/2}, \mathcal{A}^{(1)}, \mathcal{M}^{(1)}, \mathcal{B}^{(0)}, \mathcal{N}^{(0)})$, for $n \in \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{Z}$. Let

$$\begin{aligned}
H^{(1)}_{\mathcal{A}^{(0)},\mathcal{M}^{(0)}}(x,\varphi) &= \tilde{E}(\mathcal{A}^{(0)}, i\mathcal{M}^{(0)}) \circ I(x,\varphi)\\
H^{(2)}_{\beta_0^{1/2},\mathcal{B}^{(1)},\mathcal{N}^{(1)}}(x,\varphi) &= \hat{E}(\beta_0^{\frac{1}{2}}, \mathcal{B}^{(1)}, \mathcal{N}^{(1)})(x,\varphi)\\
F^{(1)}_{\alpha_0^{1/2},\mathcal{A}^{(1)},\mathcal{M}^{(1)},\mathcal{B}^{(0)},\mathcal{N}^{(0)}}(x,\varphi) &= I \circ \tilde{E}(\{\Psi_{-n}, i\Psi_{-n+\frac{1}{2}}\}_{n\in\mathbb{Z}_+}) \circ I(x,\varphi)\\
F^{(2)}_{\alpha_0^{1/2},\mathcal{A}^{(1)},\mathcal{M}^{(1)},\mathcal{B}^{(0)},\mathcal{N}^{(0)}}(x,\varphi) &= \hat{E}(\exp(\Psi_0){\alpha_0}^{-\frac{1}{2}}, \{\exp(2n\Psi_0){\alpha_0}^{-n}\Psi_n,\\
&\qquad \exp(2(n-\frac{1}{2})\Psi_0){\alpha_0}^{-n+\frac{1}{2}}\Psi_{n-\frac{1}{2}}\}_{n\in\mathbb{Z}_+})(x,\varphi)
\end{aligned}$$

Then from the definition of $\Phi^{(01)}(\mathcal{AM}^{(01)}, \mathcal{BN}^{(01)})$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\varphi\Phi^{(0)}_n &= \varphi\mathrm{Res}_x x^n (H^{(1)}_{\mathcal{A}^{(0)},\mathcal{M}^{(0)}} \circ (F^{(1)}_{\alpha_0^{1/2},\mathcal{A}^{(1)},\mathcal{M}^{(1)},\mathcal{B}^{(0)},\mathcal{N}^{(0)}})^{-1}(x,\varphi))^0\\
\varphi\Phi^{(0)}_{n-\frac{1}{2}} &= i\varphi\mathrm{Res}_x x^{n-1} (H^{(1)}_{\mathcal{A}^{(0)},\mathcal{M}^{(0)}} \circ (F^{(1)}_{\alpha_0^{1/2},\mathcal{A}^{(1)},\mathcal{M}^{(1)},\mathcal{B}^{(0)},\mathcal{N}^{(0)}})^{-1}(x,\varphi))^1\\
\varphi\lambda_0^{\frac{1}{2}} &= \varphi\mathrm{Res}_x x^{-2} (H^{(2)}_{\beta_0^{1/2},\mathcal{B}^{(1)},\mathcal{N}^{(1)}} \circ (F^{(2)}_{\alpha_0^{1/2},\mathcal{A}^{(1)},\mathcal{M}^{(1)},\mathcal{B}^{(0)},\mathcal{N}^{(0)}})^{-1}(x,\varphi))^0\\
\varphi\Phi^{(1)}_n &= \varphi\mathrm{Res}_x x^{-n-2} (H^{(2)}_{\beta_0^{1/2},\mathcal{B}^{(1)},\mathcal{N}^{(1)}} \circ (F^{(2)}_{\alpha_0^{1/2},\mathcal{A}^{(1)},\mathcal{M}^{(1)},\mathcal{B}^{(0)},\mathcal{N}^{(0)}})^{-1}(x,\varphi))^0\\
\varphi\Phi^{(1)}_{n-\frac{1}{2}} &= \varphi\mathrm{Res}_x x^{-n-1} (H^{(2)}_{\beta_0^{1/2},\mathcal{B}^{(1)},\mathcal{N}^{(1)}} \circ (F^{(2)}_{\alpha_0^{1/2},\mathcal{A}^{(1)},\mathcal{M}^{(1)},\mathcal{B}^{(0)},\mathcal{N}^{(0)}})^{-1}(x,\varphi))^1.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus using (3.56), (3.57), (3.66), (3.67), and (3.68), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\left.\frac{\partial}{\partial\mathcal{M}^{(1)}_{k-\frac{1}{2}}}\frac{\partial}{\partial\mathcal{N}^{(0)}_{-j-\frac{1}{2}}}\Phi^{(0)}_n\right|_e &= -2\delta_{-n,j+k} & \qquad \left.\frac{\partial}{\partial\mathcal{M}^{(0)}_{-j-\frac{1}{2}}}\frac{\partial}{\partial\mathcal{M}^{(1)}_{k-\frac{1}{2}}}\Phi^{(0)}_n\right|_e &= 0\\
\left.\frac{\partial}{\partial\mathcal{M}^{(1)}_{k-\frac{1}{2}}}\frac{\partial}{\partial\mathcal{N}^{(0)}_{-j-\frac{1}{2}}}\Phi^{(0)}_{n-\frac{1}{2}}\right|_e &= 0 & \qquad \left.\frac{\partial}{\partial\mathcal{M}^{(0)}_{-j-\frac{1}{2}}}\frac{\partial}{\partial\mathcal{M}^{(1)}_{k-\frac{1}{2}}}\Phi^{(0)}_{n-\frac{1}{2}}\right|_e &= 0\\
\left.\frac{\partial}{\partial\mathcal{M}^{(1)}_{k-\frac{1}{2}}}\frac{\partial}{\partial\mathcal{N}^{(0)}_{-j-\frac{1}{2}}}\lambda_0^{\frac{1}{2}}\right|_e &= -2\delta_{0,j+k} & \qquad \left.\frac{\partial}{\partial\mathcal{M}^{(0)}_{-j-\frac{1}{2}}}\frac{\partial}{\partial\mathcal{M}^{(1)}_{k-\frac{1}{2}}}\lambda_0^{\frac{1}{2}}\right|_e &= 0\\
\left.\frac{\partial}{\partial\mathcal{M}^{(1)}_{k-\frac{1}{2}}}\frac{\partial}{\partial\mathcal{N}^{(0)}_{-j-\frac{1}{2}}}\Phi^{(1)}_n\right|_e &= -2\delta_{n,j+k} & \qquad \left.\frac{\partial}{\partial\mathcal{M}^{(0)}_{-j-\frac{1}{2}}}\frac{\partial}{\partial\mathcal{M}^{(1)}_{k-\frac{1}{2}}}\Phi^{(1)}_n\right|_e &= 0\\
\left.\frac{\partial}{\partial\mathcal{M}^{(1)}_{k-\frac{1}{2}}}\frac{\partial}{\partial\mathcal{N}^{(0)}_{-j-\frac{1}{2}}}\Phi^{(1)}_{n-\frac{1}{2}}\right|_e &= 0 & \qquad \left.\frac{\partial}{\partial\mathcal{M}^{(0)}_{-j-\frac{1}{2}}}\frac{\partial}{\partial\mathcal{M}^{(1)}_{k-\frac{1}{2}}}\Phi^{(1)}_{n-\frac{1}{2}}\right|_e &= 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Substituting these calculations into (4.50), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\Big[\mathcal{G}(j+\frac{1}{2}), \mathcal{G}(k-\frac{1}{2})\Big]F \\
= \;& \sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}_+}\left(-2\delta_{-n,j+k}\frac{\partial}{\partial\Phi_n^{(0)}}F(\Phi^{(01)})\bigg|_e + \delta_{n,-j}\frac{\partial}{\partial\Phi_{k-\frac{1}{2}}^{(1)}}\frac{\partial}{\partial\Phi_{n-\frac{1}{2}}^{(0)}}F(\Phi^{(01)})\bigg|_e\right) \\
& - 2\delta_{0,j+k}\;\frac{\partial}{\partial\lambda_0^{\frac{1}{2}}}F(\Phi^{(01)})\Bigg|_e \\
& + \sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}_+}\left(-2\delta_{n,j+k}\frac{\partial}{\partial\Phi_n^{(1)}}F(\Phi^{(01)})\bigg|_e + \delta_{n,k}\frac{\partial}{\partial\Phi_{-j-\frac{1}{2}}^{(0)}}\frac{\partial}{\partial\Phi_{n-\frac{1}{2}}^{(1)}}F(\Phi^{(01)})\bigg|_e\right) \\
= \;& \begin{cases} -2\frac{\partial}{\partial\Phi_{-j-k}^{(0)}}F(\Phi^{(01)})\Big|_e & \text{if} \quad k < -j \\ -2\frac{\partial}{\partial\lambda_0^{\frac{1}{2}}}F(\Phi^{(01)})\Big|_e & \text{if} \quad k = -j \\ -2\frac{\partial}{\partial\Phi_{j+k}^{(1)}}F(\Phi^{(01)})\Big|_e & \text{if} \quad k > -j \end{cases} \\
= \;& 2\mathcal{L}(j+k).
\end{aligned}$$

□

Bibliography

[B1] K. Barron, *The supergeometric interpretation of vertex operator superalgebras*, Ph.D. thesis, Rutgers University, 1996.

[B2] K. Barron, A supergeometric interpretation of vertex operator superalgebras, *Int. Math. Res. Notices*, 1996 No. 9, Duke University Press, 409–430.

[B3] K. Barron, $N = 1$ Neveu-Schwarz vertex operator superalgebras over Grassmann algebras and with odd formal variables, in: *Representations and Quantizations: Proceedings of the International Conference on Representation Theory, 1998*, ed. J. Wang and Z. Lin, China Higher Education Press & Springer-Verlag, Beijing, 2000, 9 – 36.

[BDM] K. Barron, C. Dong and G. Mason, Twisted sectors for tensor product vertex operator algebras associated to permutation groups, *Commun. Math. Phys.*, **227**, (2002), 349–384.

[BHL] K. Barron, Y.-Z. Huang and J. Lepowsky, Factorization of formal exponentials and uniformization, *J. Alg.* **228** (2000), 551–579.

[Bc1] M. Batchelor, Two approaches to supermanifolds, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **258**, Num. 1, 1980, 257–270.

[Bc2] M. Batchelor, In search of the graded manifolds of maps between graded manifolds, *Lecture Notes in Phys.* **311**, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1987, 62–113.

[BMS] A. A. Beilinson, Yu. I. Manin and V. V. Schechtman, Sheaves of the Virasoro and Neveu-Schwarz algebras, in *k-Theory, Arithmetic, and Geometry*, Lecture Notes in Math. **1289**, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1987, 52–66.

[BPZ] A. A. Belavin, A. M. Polyakov and A. B. Zamolodchikov, Infinite conformal symmetries in two-dimensional quantum field theory, *Nuclear Phys.* **B241** (1984), 333–380.

[Bo] R. Borcherds, Vertex algebras, Kac-Moody algebras, and the Monster, *Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. USA* **83** (1986), 3068–3071.

[CR] L. Crane and J. Rabin, Super Riemann surfaces: uniformization and Teichmüller theory, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **113** (1988), 601–623.

[D] B. DeWitt, *Supermanifolds*, 2nd ed., Cambridge Monogr. Math. Phys., Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 1992.

[DHVW1] L. Dixon, J. A. Harvey, C. Vafa and E. Witten, Strings on orbifolds, *Nucl. Phys.* **B261** (1985), 620–678.

[DHVW2] L. Dixon, J. A. Harvey, C. Vafa and E. Witten, Strings on orbifolds II, *Nucl. Phys.* **B274** (1986), 285–314.

[DL] C. Dong and J. Lepowsky, Generalized Vertex Algebras and Relative Vertex Operators, *Progr. Math.* **112**, Birkhäuser, Boston, 1993.

[DMZ] C. Dong, G. Mason and Y. Zhu, Discrete series of the Virasoro algebra and the moonshine module, in: *Algebraic Groups and Their Generalizations: Quantum and Infinite-Dimensional Methods*, ed. William J. Haboush and Brian J. Parshall, Proc. Symp. Pure Math., Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, 1994, Vol. 56, Part 2, 295–316.

[FF] B. L. Feigin and D. B. Fuchs, Verma modules over the Virasoro algebra, in: *Topology*, Lecture Notes in Math. **1060**, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1984, 230–245.

[FFR] A. J. Feingold, I. B. Frenkel and J. F. X. Ries, *Spinor Construction of Vertex Operator Algebras, Triality and* $E_8^{(1)}$, Contemp. Math. **121**, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, 1991.

[FG] W. Fischer and H. Grauert, Lokal-triviale Familien kompakter komplexer Mannigfaltigkeiten, *Nachr. Akad. Wiss. Göttingen Math.-Phys. Kl.* 1965, 89–94.

[FHL] I. B. Frenkel, Y.-Z. Huang and J. Lepowsky, *On axiomatic approaches to vertex operator algebras and modules*, Memoirs Amer. Math. Soc. **104**, Num. 494, 1993.

[FLM] I. B. Frenkel, J. Lepowsky and A. Meurman, *Vertex Operator Algebras and the Monster*, Academic Press, New York, 1988.

[FZ] I. B. Frenkel and Y. Zhu, Vertex operator algebras associated to representations of affine and Virasoro algebras, *Duke Math. J.* **66** (1992), 123–168.

[Fd] D. Friedan, Notes on string theory and two-dimensional conformal field theory, in: *Unified String Theories*, World Scientific, Singapore, 1986, 162–213.

[FS] D. Friedan and S. Shenker, The analytic geometry of two-dimensional conformal field theory, *Nucl. Phys.* **B281** (1987), 509–545.

[G] P. Goddard, Meromorphic conformal field theory, in: *Infinite-Dimensional Lie Algebras and Groups*, ed. by V. Kac, Adv. Ser. Math. Phys. **7**, World Scientific, Teaneck, N.J., 1989, 556–587.

[GKO] P. Goddard, A. Kent and D. Olive, Unitary Representations of the Virasoro and Super-Virasoro Algebras, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **103** (1986), 105–119.

[H1] Y.-Z. Huang, *On the geometric interpretation of vertex operator algebras*, Ph.D. thesis, Rutgers University, 1990.

[H2] Y.-Z. Huang, *Two-Dimensional Conformal Geometry and Vertex Operator Algebras*, Progress in Math. Vol. 148, Birkhäuser, Boston, 1997.

[H3] Y.-Z. Huang, A theory of tensor products for module categories for a vertex operator algebra, IV, *J. Pure Appl. Alg.* **100** (1995), 173–216.

[H4] Y.-Z. Huang, A nonmeromorphic extension of the moonshine module vertex operator algebra, in: *Moonshine, the Monster and related topics, Proc. Joint Summer Research Conference, Mount Holyoke, 1994*, ed. C. Dong and G. Mason, Contemporary Math., Vol. 193, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, 1996, 123–148.

[HL1] Y.-Z. Huang and J. Lepowsky, Toward a theory of tensor products for representations of a vertex operator algebra, in: *Proc. 20th International Conference on Differential Geometric Methods in Theoretical Physics, New York, 1991*, ed. S. Catto and A. Rocha, World Scientific, Singapore, 1992, 344–354.

[HL2] Y.-Z. Huang and J. Lepowsky, Vertex operator algebras and operads, in: *The Gelfand Mathematical Seminar, 1990–1992*, ed. L. Corwin, I. Gelfand and J. Lepowsky, Birkhäuser, Boston, 1993, 145–161.

[HL3] Y.-Z. Huang and J. Lepowsky, Operadic formulation of the notion of vertex operator algebra, in: *Mathematical Aspects of Conformal and Topological Field Theories and Quantum Groups*, ed. P. Sally, M. Flato, J. Lepowsky, N. Reshetikhin and G. Zuckerman, Contemp. Math. **175**, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, 1994, 131–148.

[HL4] Y.-Z. Huang and J. Lepowsky, A theory of tensor products for module categories for a vertex operator algebra, I, *Selecta Mathematica, New Series* **1** (1995), 699–756.

[HL5] Y.-Z. Huang and J. Lepowsky, A theory of tensor products for module categories for a vertex operator algebra, II, *Selecta Mathematica, New Series* **1** (1995), 757–786.

[HL6] Y.-Z. Huang and J. Lepowsky, Tensor products of modules for vertex operator algebras and vertex tensor categories, in: *Lie Theory and Geometry, in honor of Bertram Kostant*, ed. R. Brylinski, J.-L. Brylinski, V. Guillemin and V. Kac, Birkhäuser, Boston, 349–383.

[HL7] Y.-Z. Huang and J. Lepowsky, A theory of tensor products for module categories for a vertex operator algebra, III, *J. Pure Appl. Alg.* **100** (1995), 141–171.

[K] V. Kac, Lie superalgebras, *Adv. Math.* **26** (1977), 8–96.

[KW] V. Kac and W. Wang, Vertex operator superalgebras and their representations, in: *Mathematical Aspects of Conformal and Topological Field Theories and Quantum Groups*, ed. P. Sally, M. Flato, J. Lepowsky, N. Reshetikhin and G. Zuckerman, Contemp. Math. **175**, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, 1994, 161–191.

[KT] Y. Kanie and A. Tsuchiya, Vertex operators in conformal field theory on $\mathbb{P}^1$ and monodromy representations of braid groups, in: *Conformal Field Theory and Solvable Lattice Models, Advanced Studies in Pure Math.* **16**, Kinokuniya Company Ltd., Tokyo, 1988, 297–372.

[L] L. Lempert, The problem of complexifying a Lie group, in: *Multidimensional Complex Analysis and Partial Differential Equations*, ed. P. Cordaro and H. Jacobowitz, Contemp. Math. **205**, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, 1997, 169–176.

[M] J. P. May, *The geometry of iterated loop spaces*, Lecture Notes in Math., No. 271, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1972.

[NS] A. Neveu and J. H. Schwarz, Factorizable dual model of pions, *Nucl. Phys.* **B31** (1971), 86–112.

[Re] C. Reutenauer, *Free Lie Algebras*, London Math. Soc. Monographs, New Series, 7, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1993.

[Ro1] A. Rogers, Super Lie groups: global topology and local structure, *J. Math. Phys.* **22** (5) (1981), 939–945.

[Ro2] A. Rogers, Graded manifolds, supermanifolds and infinite-dimensional Grassmann algebras, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **105** (1986), 375–384.

[S] G. Segal, The definition of conformal field theory, preprint.

[T] H. Tsukada, Vertex operator superalgebras, *Comm. Algebra* **18** (1990), 2249–2274.

[V] C. Vafa, Conformal theories and punctured surfaces, *Phys. Lett.* **B199** (1987), 195–202.

[Wa] W. Wang, Rationality of Virasoro vertex operator algebras, *Int. Math. Res. Notices* (in *Duke Math. J.*) **7** (1993), 197–211.

[Wi] E. Witten, Non-abelian bosonization in two dimensions, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **92** (1984), 455–472.

[Za] A. B. Zamolodchikov, Infinite additional symmetries in two dimensional conformal quantum field theory, *Theor. Math. Phys.* **65** (1985), 1205–1213.

[Zh1] Y. Zhu, Vertex operators, elliptic functions and modular forms, Ph.D. thesis, Yale University, 1990.

[Zh2] Y. Zhu, Modular invariance of characters of vertex operator algebras, *J. Amer. Math. Soc.* **9** (1996), 237–307.